

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. IV.

January, 1907.

No. 1.

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN.

BY REV. P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON, M. A., GLASGOW, SCOTLAND.

Not, indeed, the deepest, but the most patent and therefore to the general mind the first, difficulty which disputes with faith among the facts of life arises out of the spectacle of the pain and sorrow and wrong that are so manifest in the world. These things are real and indisputable and are sometimes almost unbearable. They are not only severe but apparently so wanton and—what presses most of all on faith—they are often utterly unjust. Conscience, which is our great internal teacher of religion, bids us believe in a God who is just and moral: Christ who is our great historical religious Master, tells us God loves the world. But is it easy to look the world in the face and say that it is what we should expect from the hand of a righteous, not to say a fatherly and loving Being? The suffering of life and the injustice of things at once impugn the whole witness of conscience and of Christ about God:

“The world is dark with griefs and graves,
So dark, that men cry out against the heavens.”

The challenge is as old as Celsus and as recent as the *Clarion*, but it seems to come with special emphasis today. The modern mind is acquainted with the details of the struggle for existence so ruthlessly carried on in all the animal world, while modern emotion, tolerant of the more strictly ethical aspects of evil, is very sensitive

V. 4
1907
2

to its pathological side. This is both a scientific and a philanthropic age and the knowledge given by the former interest and the sympathy generated by the latter unite in raising the problem of pain with peculiar urgency. But while science and philanthropy make us feel the problem, they may justly say they are not called on to answer it. To them, pain in the world is a fact to be observed or meliorated, not a mystery to solve. It is on Christian faith that the *onus* of some sort of a solution lies. It is the faith that speaks of a beneficent Creator who cares for the sparrows which may justly be asked what it makes of the butchery in animal life; it is the faith that calls God both the Eternal Righteousness and the Eternal Love that may be brought to book by the thought of the wrong and the suffering of human life. It is the believer who, in the face of these things, is asked if there is pity, fairness, love with the Most High. Religion is asked today as flatly as in the days of Epicurus or of Hume whether it is that God is unwilling to prevent evil or that he is unable to prevent it or both. And often the only thing that many a perplexed mind can say is, "When I thought upon this it was too painful for me." But a faith frank with itself must think upon it.

It may sound a paradox, but, to my mind, the most hopeful thing about the problem is just that pain is so real and deep an element in life. What I mean is this. If it were something clearly separate from the processes of nature, only hindering them and hurting them, then it would be a despairingly irrational fact. But pain is too deep in life for that. It is a factor—it might be called the great factor—alike in physical evolution as the animal struggles for existence and in spiritual as man is perfected through suffering. To object to pain then, is to object not to some foreign element in life, like a needle in the body, but to the process of life itself as we know it, like gowing muscular action. Pain, therefore—whether or not its presence is reconciled with Divine morality or

love—is quite clearly not an irrational thing; and this suggests that the true way of thinking about it is not to attempt to minimize it, and, if possible (and Christian science seems to find it possible) to eliminate it, but rather to understand its function and even magnify that. Another fact about pain is in line with this and is, I think, a fact worth noticing particularly. Pain increases as nature evolves. Nature evolves physically and more highly organized animals feel more than the lower; it evolves to conscious reason, and man has deeper sorrows than the brute; it evolves socially, and civilized man has more complex pains than the savage; it evolves spiritually and the saint has agonies that the sensual or selfish man never knows; and—one may add it with reverence—the crown on the head of the Perfect Man was truly the Crown of Thorns. I do not forget that it is true that, as man becomes higher, he increases also his joy. Still it is through pain that these higher joys are reached, and to the end (in this world) they are subtly touched with tears; the purest joy of purest souls is love and *Caritas est passio*. All this suggests that there is not only meaning in pain—which even natural selection shows—but growing moral meaning. It is thought to impugn God's moral character. What if it turn out to witness to it in the end?

Now, if one's aim were that of minimizing and, if possible, eliminating pain, one would naturally begin with its minor manifestation and palliate these as far at least as it is feasible to go; but if one is seeking a meaning and a moral meaning in pain, it is obvious that will be best sought where that meaning is most fully expressed—that is, in man's spiritual life. I have just indicated that the latter seems the true method; nevertheless it may be convenient in the first place to say a few things about pain in the animal world so as to clear the ground.

I am not one of those who think there is no problem in the facts of suffering in the animal world, but certainly it is often grossly overstated. For this, Mill's famous in-

dictment of Nature and Tennyson's constantly quoted line about her being "red in tooth and claw with ravine" are largely responsible. Both the philosopher and the poet have let their imagination loose on the subject. A just mind recognizes that, while there is pain in the animal world, there is infinitely more pleasure. Dr. Russell Wallace—almost the most trustworthy authority that could be quoted on the subject—says that animals in nature "have an almost perpetual enjoyment in their lives." In point of the amount of it, then, we must not exaggerate the pain of animal life; it is a very small percentage of its joy. Even more easily is it exaggerated as regards its intensity. Animals feel pain, for there seems to be nothing attractive either to science or faith in the idea, originating from Descartes and re-stated in somewhat altered form by a recent writer,* that animals are automata, and, not having consciousness, do not know what pain is—nothing attractive to science because it is unverifiable, and nothing to faith because in freeing the realm of sentient animal life of pain, it at the same time robs it of all joy and so immensely impoverishes creation. But though animals suffer, their sufferings have nothing of the intensity that human suffering has. To a very great degree, the intensity of human suffering lies in such things as our massing our griefs together, our anticipating them, our reflections upon them; these torture far more exquisitely than the moment of physical pain, which indeed seems in a strange way often to bring its own anæsthetic. Animals have nothing of these intenser pains. It is sheer nonsense to speak of their sufferings as approaching what ours would be in their circumstances. A man exposed to daily risk of death, in constant struggle for good, encircled by ruthless enemies, and before whose eyes his fellows were constantly being murdered would go mad; the bird or beast in such conditions sings and gambols all the day. And the conclusion of the whole

* W. E. Kay Robinson in "The Religion of Nature."

matter—for I do not wish to spend more time on a theme that has often been discussed (and I claim no originality for the above remarks on it)—is thus summed up by the great English naturalist whom I have already quoted. “Given,” he says, “the necessity of death and reproduction—and without these there could have been no progressive development of the animal world—it is difficult even to imagine a system by which a greater balance of happiness could have been secured”; while of the particular feature of development with which pain is associated, namely, the struggle for existence, he declares that “it brings the maximum of life and enjoyment with the minimum of suffering.” Mr. Morley in his life of Gladstone, remarks a little contemptuously that “of course optimism like this is indispensable as the basis of natural theology.” If so, it is satisfactory to have an eminent authority expressing it from the standpoint of natural science.

When we come to the problem of pain in relation to man, we come to a quite different problem. Everything is to be viewed in relation to the end and purpose of that to which it belongs—holes which would spoil a drum are necessary to a net—and, in passing from animal life to human we pass from an existence whose end and purpose are merely sentient to one whose end and purpose are ethical and spiritual. Before a word is said about the problem of pain in man, we must recognize this. It will lead only to cross purposes if pain is complained of on hedonistic grounds because it hinders man’s pleasure and justified on moral grounds because it helps his character. We must first clearly see and say which is man’s true end. Now, hedonism always has its appeal to us to recognize in it our end, because as Coleridge has said somewhere, we can disclaim our nature as moral beings but we cannot disclaim our nature as sentient beings. Yet I do not think I need be asked to contend at length here that when we do so disclaim our moral nature we are false to our true

selves. Man's true life is character. "Not enjoyment and not sorrow is our destined end and way." If we agree to this, the whole problem changes and—while it certainly does not dissipate—clears. All the pessimism which is but the chagrin of defeated hedonism is out of place. But, in candor one must add that all the optimism which is based upon the minimizing of pain is also out of place. I have argued—because I think the facts demand it—that it relieves to some extent the problem of pain in relation to the animal world to remember that animals do not suffer with the intensity we do. But if one tries to take that argument higher than the animal world, it turns against one's self. An American writer on the problem, Dr. Minot Savage, seems strangely to fail to see this. After most justly minimizing the exaggerations of animal suffering, he goes on "to take a step higher than the animal world" and, on precisely similar lines, argues it is a mistake for us who are civilized and cultured and comfortable to rate too highly the distresses of people in savage countries abroad or in slums at home for the former are quite content "to lead their own life" and the latter often "satisfied with the kind of tenement they live in." I doubt the accuracy of this especially as regards the slum-dweller, but does not Dr. Savage see that if it be true that is just "the pity of it"? If the real thought of a human life be not pleasure even in its low, dull form of stupid content, but be something ethical and spiritual, then the saddest thing about any man's low life is just that he is content with it. When we "take a step higher than the animal world" we take a step into a different world. Man is not "*la bête humaine*." The problem of his suffering cannot be answered, because it should not be asked, in the terms that apply to animal life. It must be asked and answered in terms of man's ethical end.

When it is thus stated, unquestionably there is some light. Man's end is ethical and spiritual; well, certainly

nothing makes for this as pain does. The modern world has cast away the mediæval—or rather, heathenish—idea that pain is in itself a good; but it is no mere ascetic idea but the testimony of every part of the moral and spiritual experience of the world that nothing else is so much the means, as pain is, of deepening the mind, disciplining the character and developing the noblest self of man. It is true of knowledge: “where we say that men learn wisdom by experience we mostly mean by experience of something painful.” It is true alike of power and of gentleness; it is by trials that a man is made both strong and tender. It is true of affections; even love is hardly quite pure till it can suffer. It is true of all greatest art; “the poets learn by suffering what they teach in song” and “the half of music is to have grieved.” These are not merely rhetorical phrases. They are outstanding facts about the life of man. Joy too has its good; at its truest, joy can even purify. Yet a human life that knew only joy would be an ignoble life. It is not asceticism, it is not even only religion, but it is the whole range of man’s moral and spiritual experience which testifies that, without the discipline of suffering, life cannot become noble and will not become even good. This is not to say that suffering always succeeds in making life noble and good. There are facts that deny that. One must never forget in generalizing about life, that there is still such a thing as individuality. In certain cases, suffering deadens rather than illumines, and embitters rather than purifies. But this—which is really of the effects of sin rather than the effects of pain—does not alter the broad truth, to which every fact in the spiritual life consents, that man cannot be noble or good without suffering. Perhaps, however, this is more convincingly said not as a broad truth but as a personal experience. A large number of men, as they go through life, meet somewhere, and have to pass through an illness—a grave illness. At the time it often seems a hard lot and a sheer loss. But, after-

wards how many a man has found that that time of trial and loss was really the best thing that ever happened to him, and that, if there is in his mind any depth or in his heart any tenderness or in his soul any true sense of God, it largely dates from it. He knows what the Psalmist meant who said "It is good that I have been afflicted."

And all this has a deeper aspect. How is it that our moral nature thus needs pain to develop it? The reason—or at least a reason—is not far to seek. If our moral nature were so perfectly in love with good that the ideal had only to be set before us in order that instinctively and gladly we sought after it, then it would be difficult to see how we needed pain—though even then it would remain true that some of the finer moral qualities, such as sympathy or bearing for another, might still need this element for their development. But, (however it may be as regards this last point), we all know that ours is not a nature perfectly in love with good. There is—and again this is no mere dogma of religion but the broadest fact of all experience—another element. And if we are even to be morally saved, this element—which is what the theologians call sin and the ethicists the bad self—needs to be disciplined, to be warned and threatened, to be punished. Pain does all this. Pain then, which *may* be necessary even for a nature which is in love with good to add its finer perfections, is *certainly* necessary for a nature which is in love often with evil to show it sharply its errors and penalize them. I do not enter in this paper into the question as to the source of this dark element in our life; that is a subject by itself which has its own perplexities. But that element is there. Its existence is too plain to be denied. And because it is there, pain—with its warnings and its penalties—not only is there too but *ought* to be there too. A world in which there is moral evil and no attendant physical evil would indeed be an immoral world; and when one thinks—or rather begins to think, for the conception stretches far beyond us—

how immense the fact of moral evil is in the world, then we should ask not why there is so much pain in the world but why there is not more. But perhaps this too, like the former point, is best said not in general terms about the world, but in the particular terms of personal experience. Speaking of the good which affliction brought to character, I quoted from one Psalm words which evoke a deep response from many an afflicted life. There may be quoted from another Psalm an even more striking testimony which, I will venture to say, no humble and honest conscience dares dispute. It is this: "He hath not dealt with us according to our sins nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." It is difficult to say this of others' afflictions often (and this reminds us we have still to face the greatest of all questions about pain in the world which is the injustice of it) but, in our conscience, we say it of our own. The severity of Divine discipline is our problem when we look without; the righteousness and even mercy of it when we look within. His biographer, not unnaturally, called a great Christian's sufferings "cruel;" but Mr. Gladstone himself died singing praise of Him Who is "most just in all His ways."

Although, as I have just said, the acutest part of our whole question still lies before us, it may be well first to draw the conclusion that arises out of what has been said about pain and the life of man. The conclusion—the only possible conclusion—is that pain, instead of impugning, really evidences the moral interest of God. He afflicts man because, above every other end, He would make moral character, and nothing works for this as pain does. Pain is then a great witness to the fact that, higher even than happiness, God values moral life and moral law. Ah! is it not turning out that the presence of pain means, not that God is not careful enough about morality, but that He is *too* careful about it. It is we who do not enough care about it—do not care enough about it to make us welcome this great educator of the moral life and

great avenger of the moral law. Our argument with God about His means, which is pain, is really an argument with Him about His end, which is moral salvation. But this is God's end—His real and serious and determined end; and the world is made accordingly. Therefore it is a "scheme of the weal and the woe" for without this latter—so far as we can see—it would not achieve that end which is the spiritual character of man.

But we must now come to what is the last and severest difficulty—the appalling *injustice* of the world's pain. This is a very acute enigma. Think of but one right aspect of it; think of the wrongs and sufferings endured by thousands of helpless, innocent little children, born into cruelty and neglect, where lives are a daily appeal for a justice that seems to have no ear. The considerations we have found to go far to explain suffering among men have little or no application here. How is a little child purified by childish suffering? The child's path to virtue is through happiness. How does any idea of the punitive or preventive idea of pain apply? Surely a little, innocent life does not deserve that. The thing is unjust. We have the moral right to call it unjust in God's world or anywhere else. It is no blatant, irreverent unbelief that does this. It is a charge prompted by the very truest ethical instinct of our nature. Justice is one of the most sacred of secular words. It is a very name of God. If God fails here, He is not God. Yet, how palpable are the facts of injustice in life. How indifferently, how indiscriminately evil and pain fall on the just as on the unjust. The guilty sin and the innocent suffer. A father is vicious and his children die in an asylum. A man does wrong and hundreds are dragged into distress by his deed. It is no answer to point to his sin. That he sinned accounts justly for *his* suffering; but it does not make the suffering of others just. The wrong of these impeaches Heaven. Here the Christian thought of God seems to meet a sheer shriek of contradiction.

There is a question here, which sometimes, when we are brought face to face with a poignant example of it, makes faith simply stand still.

I cannot see that this question is really met along the line usually offered for its relief, namely, the supreme spiritual value of vicarious suffering. Certainly, no words can exaggerate either the moral depths or the moral beauty and power that are in such sorrow as that. It has inspired the greatest thoughts of literature—the Greek tragedian's "Antigone" or the Hebrew prophet's "Suffering Servant." It has put their very crown upon the brow of the saints—"the martyr first." It makes suffering not merely a gain in good, but, "become emphatically *the good*." And it—it alone—has redeemed the world; "the sufferings of the just" says a modern teacher,* "are the saving thing in human history." And yet if all this good is attained through sheer injustice! However exquisitely be chiseled the capital of the pillar of virtue, what avail it if the base be rottenness? It may be said that the objection to the justice of vicarious suffering is taken away when the sufferer is voluntary as well as vicarious. I have never been altogether clear even about that, but it is unnecessary to discuss it, for what of the countless cases where it is not voluntary? Think again of the little children. Ah! is it not a strange thing that one of the keenest darts that pierces faith comes not from the loud denials of unbelief or the critical century of philosophy or the chilling sneer of culture, but from the wan face, the pleading eyes, the pain-marred frame of some little child? Those, faith is not one moment afraid to look in the face and even proudly answer; this, it can hardly bear to see and is dumb before it. I recall a happy little child whom Jesus once placed in the midst of his disciples to teach them faith. There are other little children in the world and when we place them in our midst our faith seems—I repeat it—to stand still.

* Harnack.

There is a mental habit which is always salutary and which is never more useful than when we are shut up to a difficulty, namely, to think out what is involved in the alternative. Let us use that method here. The problem is that when a man does evil not only he but others who are innocent are involved in suffering. But think what it would mean if this were not so. It could be prevented only if the man's life were something isolated from other lives and terminated in itself—if, in short, we were not "members one of another" but each man did "live for himself." Does any thinking person desire that this should be the law of human life? It would not only impoverish life, but it would ruin it. It would make impossible the whole progress of humanity from age to age and race to race and man to man. What is it which makes the riches, even the very meaning, of my life? It is not what I myself have learned, discovered, done, earned. It is what I have inherited from the past and from others' lives around. Without this solidarity human life would be unthinkable. In his essay on Nature, to which I have already had occasion to refer, J. S. Mill says the just law, if God were omnipotent, would be that "each person's share of suffering and happiness would be exactly proportioned to good or evil deeds and no human being would have a worse lot than another without worse deserts." This is a strange and difficult world of ours, but after all, I am thankful I live in it rather than in the world Mill would make in the name of justice. My share of happiness reduced to what is exactly proportioned to my good deeds would leave me not only morally but also intellectually on the verge of starvation; it is others' great and good deeds—others' moral triumphs and others' intellectual riches—that are the food of my soul. And if no human being is to have a worse lot than another without worse deserts, then no human being should have a better without better deserts; what desert, then, had Mill to the comforts of civilization or the culture of the

ages which a pre-historic savage never enjoyed, though his individual life—poor fellow—may have been quite as deserving? It seems, thus, we must revise our idea of justice. Mill is quite right if the sheer individualist idea of man as an isolated unit is right. But that idea of man is out and out wrong. We *are* “members one of another” and *no* man “liveth unto himself.” We live together and suffer together; we struggle together and progress together. It is the greatest law in humanity—without it the word “humanity” could have no meaning—and to repeal it would be universal ruin. But, it may be said, God—Mill’s “Omnipotent Creator”—should repeal it as regards evil. Surely that will not bear thinking out. A world with one set of laws for virtue and another for vice would be perhaps the most disadvantageous world for morality that could be. One of the great moral bases of the world is just the impartiality (so to speak) with which the laws of life are meted out alike to the good and the bad. Of no law is this more true than this law of solidarity of which I am speaking. When evil comes from this—the poignant evil of the injustice of innocent suffering lives—it is not because the law which is the channel of that injustice is evil, but it is because the source is evil—the deeds which put the law into operation. If men’s deeds were good the law of solidarity would be nothing but blessing. The injustice we see arises not from the laws of God but the lives of men. It drives us back then to the problem of sin into which this paper does not enter.

And yet—shall I end a discussion of God’s relation to the pains of the world by a word of repudiating responsibility? That were not even human; it certainly is not Christian. We do God poor honor in an argument if we are satisfied with that. God is not self-justification; God is love. After you have finished all your reasonings about pain and proved its laws are just and necessary and wise and beneficial, still the *sufferers remain*. And after logic has done its part in discussing them, there still re-

mains the part of love which is to visit them, to share their sufferings, to be beside them in the very endurance of their pain. And is not this how Jesus Christ has visited this world of suffering men and women and children? "If they suffer, did not He on their account suffer also? If suffering falls not always on the most guilty, was not He innocent? Shall they cry aloud that the world is ill-designed, when He for their sakes subjected himself to their condition?" Surely here is something that comes far closer to the heart than even a Divine explanation of suffering. Here is a Divine participation in it. Here is a Divine Sufferer Who with all our afflictions was Himself afflicted. After all, it is not philosophy that this suffering world needs, but sympathy. This sympathy is in Christ. He *shares* human suffering. And thereby He is knit to humanity by one of the strongest and tenderest and most sacred of ties—the knowledge of a common pain, the bearing *together* of a cross.

II.

ATTEMPTS TO ELIMINATE THE SUPERNATURAL FROM THE GOSPEL HISTORY.*

BY PRINCIPAL JAMES IVERACH, D. D., FREE CHURCH COLLEGE,
ABERDEEN, SCOTLAND.

We are constantly reminded by historical critics of the tendency to clothe the great personalities of prophet, teacher, or religious leader with the vesture of imagination, and of the tendency on the part of disciples to raise the figure of their master to superhuman proportions. As illustration of this tendency we are referred to the story of all great founders of religion, and the Buddha, Zoroaster, and others are frequently quoted. There is such a tendency. Disciples exalt their master, adventitious circumstances are invented, old traditions of greatness floating in the popular imagination condense themselves anew and settle down on the figure of the prophet, or religious leader, until the historical proportions are altogether lost. But it has also to be observed that such modifications of the historical figure, and such transformations are always in the line of the action of the imaginative workings of the people. For the most part the greatening of the figure of the religious leader proceeds in the line of what seems great to the imagination of the people who make them. They often lead to the exaltation of the prophet as soon as he begins to be.

At my nativity

The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes
Of burning cressets; and at my birth

The frame and huge foundation of the earth
Shaked like a coward.

* The first division of Professor Iverach's article appeared in the October number of *The Review and Expositor*.—Editor.

This statement which Shakespeare put into the mouth of Glendower may be taken as the type of the means used by the popular imagination to exalt the person who has won their regard. For the most part the popular imagination works in the material sphere. The advent of their prophet caused disturbances in the course of nature. The magnitude of the disturbance was the measure of the greatness of the prophet. Further magnifications proceeded along the lines made familiar to them by the traditions of their race, and by the ideals which had fed and nourished them and their fathers. Time does not permit to illustrate this, I must content myself with stating it. But this tendency of the popular imagination to greatness the hero has been worked for all that it is worth as a means of reducing the New Testament to the level of ordinary literature. Thus you have books which gather together all the tales of virgin birth recorded in the literature of the nations. You have books which enumerate various aspects of events which belong to the Gospels, and the inference sought to be drawn that here the imagination and faith of the church created its objects. One might say in passing that the inference to be drawn from a widespread human belief, and from a mode of embodying it almost universal is, not that the belief is false, but that there is truth in it, if that truth should only be that it represents a real human need. Human needs have always their roots in reality. And the stories of the virgin birth represent the conviction of humanity that salvation for the race must have its origin outside of the race. And if this need was met once in the course of human history that is no reason for questioning its possibility, it is rather a reason for admiring the prophetic character of human need, and the means in the purpose of the Maker of man for meeting that need.

Glance for a moment at the characteristic features of the Gospels and ask yourselves if these are likely to have been the product of the tendency of the human imagina-

tion to magnify its favorite. Take the forehistory and ask yourselves is this the product of popular imagination. Where are the fiery shapes of burning cressets, where the shaking of the frame and huge foundations of the earth? You have instead the company of lowly people forgotten by the world. A carpenter and his betrothed, in poor and lowly circumstances, no kingly person on the scene except indirectly. Joseph and Mary, the wise men of the East, the flight into Egypt, and the world of nature and of men went on undisturbed, as if their maker had not come to them. Or take the Messianic groups of Luke. What have you? An aged priest and his wife, Mary of Nazareth, a company of Shepherds, an old man on the brink of the grave, and an old woman unheard of except as she comes into the story. Then the silence falls on the Gospel story, and the infancy, and boyhood of Jesus is unrecorded, except for one brief episode. Thirty years of silence, and a few years of activity and then the betrayal and crucifixion. I submit that these taken as they are in this brief description are not the products of a popular imagination engaged in the process of magnifying its object. Nay, on the other hand, it may be said that each of the traits of the story shows that the story lays stress on those features which the popular imagination desires to avoid, and avoids those on which the popular imagination delights to dwell. Were there time I might give you illustrations of the working of the popular imagination, and the ways it takes of making its heroes appear great. I might point in detail the difference between the Gospels and such work, but the point is sufficiently clear, and I pass on to something else.

The further space at my disposal will, it appears to me, be most profitably occupied by an examination of the means by which most frequently some endeavor to reduce Jesus to the stature of ordinary men. It was in the Messianic expectation that Christianity found the means

of clothing itself with that concreteness which enabled it to become a world-wide religion. Read Baur, Strauss, Percy Gardner either in his *Exploratio Evangelica*, or in his Jowett lectures, read Estlin Carpenter in his various works, read a hundred others who mainly echo these, and you find that they all rely on the Messianic conception as the solvent by which the supernatural can be removed from Christianity. "The simple historical structure of the life of Jesus," says Strauss, "was hung with the most varied and suggestive tapestry, of devout reflections and fancies, all the ideas entertained by primitive Christianity relative to its lost Master being transformed into facts and woven into the course of its life. The imperceptible growth of a joint creative work of this kind is made possible by oral tradition being made the medium of communication."

Or as it is put more mildly by a later writer, "The Jews brought many dogmas into the church, including scenic, semi-material Messianic categories, and the evidence shows how much activity in primitive Christianity was devoted to fixing the relations between the old dogmas and the new experience." These quotations may fix for us the question of the relation between the actual Messianic conception embodied in Christianity, and the messianic conceptions and expectations of the Jews. It is a large subject, and I shall be able to give only the barest outline of it. Yet I hope to show in brief space that between the two the only resemblance is in the name. The question is not as to the contents of the Messianic prophecies, and representations in the Old Testament, nor as to whether there are anticipations of the Christian conception in the Old Testament, the question is as to the current conceptions and expectations in the minds of the Jews at the beginning of the Christian era. It is well known, and many citations could be given in proof, that the Jews of the time of Christ never thought of their Messiah save in terms of a deliverer from temporal op-

pression, as one who would restore the kingdom to Israel, and as one who would place the feet of the Jews on the necks of their oppressors. They never identified the Messiah with the suffering servant of Jehovah, nor did it occur to them to think of Him in the terms set forth say in the twenty-second psalm. Take their literature as a whole, look at the apochryphal books, at their apocalyptic literature, at their conceptions and their desires, as embodied in their history, and we find ourselves in a circle of ideas altogether foreign to the ideal set forth in the New Testament. If the writers of Scripture had scenic, semi-material Messianic categories in their minds and hearts they were singularly successful in leaving them out of the New Testament literature. Take the Gospel ideal of Him who did not strive or cry or cause His voice to be heard in the streets, of Him who loved His enemies and prayed for them who despitefully used Him and persecuted Him, who saved others and did not save Himself, who when He was reviled, reviled not again, when He suffered He threatened not, who went about doing good, and place it alongside of the expectations of the Jews, and you will find no resemblance between the two. Take the kingdom of God as set forth in the New Testament, a kingdom which is not meat or drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, a kingdom not of this world, and place it alongside of the kingdom expected by the Jews in the Messianic time and you will necessarily conclude that the one could never have sprung out of the other. Scenic semi-material categories you will find sufficiently in the Jewish messianic expectation. In the life of Christ you will find none of such. Or if you find them it is not in connection with the earthly life and work of our Lord, nor with the life and work which culminated in the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, you will find them only in rare instances and always associated with His second coming.

Further the students of the Messianic expectations of

the Jews have not carried their studies far enough down the stream of time. They usually end them when these Messianic expectations come into contact with the founder of Christianity and the first generation of Christian believers. It would be well if they were to look for illustrations of Jewish Messianic beliefs in those historic figures which realized the Jewish ideals and in the first century gave rise to the struggle which ended in the fall of Jerusalem, and in the second century in the career of Bar-Chochba. The choice of Barrabas is not without significance in this relation. Messiahs enough you will find between 30 and 70 A. D., all of whom realized more or less completely the Jewish ideal. Judas of Galilee, the Zealots, the popular leaders of the revolt from Rome will cast light on the Jewish Messianic ideal, and on their expectations. It is well also to study the Jewish ideal in the final national endeavor of the Jews, their determined struggle under Bar-Chochba against Trajan. If these are studied we shall find ourselves amid scenic materialistic categories, and we shall find that these categories had their limits within the bounds of sense and time, and their highest outcome did not pass beyond material conditions. The kind of salvation in them is a salvation from earthly calamities, and their highest hopes were centered in a kingdom like that of David and Solomon.

Still further if you pass beyond the Jews and consider the condition of the Græco-Roman world, you will find there, too, something worthy of study in this connection. It was not among the Jews alone that there was the expectation of a deliverer, and a return of the Golden Age. You will remember that Josephus professed to find in Titus the promised deliverer of the Jews. Nor is this inconsistent with the fundamental expectation of the Jews. A deliverer from oppression was expected by almost all the world. Echoes of that expectation may be found in many quarters. This expectation found expression in the provinces of Rome in the worship of the

emperors. And in the provinces in particular emperor worship became a living, practical, and passionate religion. The pagan revival in the second century is closely associated with the worship of the emperors, and the test of Christianity was whether the Christians were willing to worship the emperors. The conflict between Christianity and heathenism was not a conflict between Greek philosophy and Christian ideas, it was a real practical conflict between competing ideals of a savior and salvation. It was a conflict between the Cæsar Savior and the Christ Savior. Between incompatible ideas of salvation. The history of the second century has to be written from this point of view. It will show the two ideals of salvation in active conflict. On the one hand was the Cæsar savior, reckoned to be divine, the living providence of the people, caring for them, enabling them to dwell in safety, defending them from their enemies, saving them from oppression, a living, present power, whose word was law to the bounds of the known world. Inscriptions tell us of this living religion, and the language of the inscriptions is full of devotional feeling. The emperor had dwarfed the old gods, and devotion to him had become the token and the sign of a revived religious life.

Here was an opportunity for the popular imagination to exert itself along familiar lines with a view to exalt its object, and it did so. Here for it was a visible object of adoration, with power beyond reckoning embodying the might and majesty of Rome, a power which the provinces had good reason to believe to be just, beneficent, strong, and the popular affection went out to it in reverent affection. On the other hand was the Christ Savior, with an ideal altogether different, with no visible power at the back of it, with sanctions altogether of the inward, spiritual sort, with motives that had their end not in the visible or temporal sphere, with rewards that had their outcome in the unseen and eternal world, with a course of conduct prescribed that cut athwart the

usual appetites, desires, and ideals of men, and the wonder is that in the long run the religion without visible sources of power conquered. It may be remarked that the conflict was not limited to the second century. It is perennial. There are still the two kinds of salvation and the two saviors in perennial conflict, and the issue is between salvation from sin, or salvation from the mere consequences of sin.

This rapid review, which I wish I had time to work out in detail, brings us back to the contention of our opponents that the Messianic expectation, if it did not create the figure of Jesus as we have it in the Gospels, at least was the means of exalting it to its superhuman proportions. I ask how did the messianic ideal of the Jews produce its opposite? The character and the work of the Christ are different from the Messiah expected by the Jews. It is not too much to say that the conception of a suffering Savior was in no mind at the time of our Lord's earthly ministry, save in his own mind alone. It was not in the mind of the Baptist, for he sent messengers to Jesus to ask, "Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?" It was not in the mind of Peter, for he took it upon him to rebuke the Master when He told the disciples of the decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. It was not in the minds of the disciples generally, for they asked at a late stage of the ministry, "Wilt thou restore the kingdom to Israel?" It was not in any mind on the eve of the crucifixion, for some pathetically said, "We trusted that it was he who should have redeemed Israel," implying that all their expectations had been buried in His grave. From all the evidence at our disposal we conclude that the history of the Gospels is truly historical. It tells us of a great figure, original in the highest sense of the word, who spoke with authority, who impressed Himself on the minds and hearts of His disciples in such a way as to reverse all their inherited ideals, to put first what they were wont

to put last, and who so stamped Himself upon their imaginations that henceforth they could read the Old Testament only in the light of Him, His sayings, His doings and His character.

Can we measure the influence, if any, which the Old Testament and the current expectations of the Jews had on the form of the history as we have it in the Synoptic Gospels. Dr. Sanday recounts the following as the usual critical expedients for explaining away miracle altogether. 1. The imitation of similar stories in the Old Testament; 2. Exaggeration of natural occurrences; 3. Translation of what was originally parable into external fact. Dr. Sanday with the candor and fairness characteristic of all his work allows that these were to some extent really at work. But this concession is qualified by the affirmation "That something of the nature of miracle, something that was understood as miracle, and that on no insignificant scale must be assumed to account for the estimate certainly formed by the whole first generation of Christians of the Person of Christ." He has here significantly touched the essence of the matter. It is about the estimate of the Person of Christ that the conflict will ultimately be waged and determined. As for myself I wish to say as to the three causes of which Dr. Sanday has spoken their action was necessarily on a very limited scale. The disciples did not read Christ in the light of the Old Testament. They read the Old Testament in the light of the impression made on them by Jesus. They went back to the Scriptures after they had known Jesus, and they read them as if a veil had been rent from off their faces. They found to their wonder and astonishment that the Old Testament was full of anticipations of just such a Savior as Jesus had proved himself to be. They had formerly read the Old Testament and they had never seen in it what they now saw. They now found that the Scriptures testified of Jesus, and that the testimony of Jesus was the spirit of

prophecy. Those who state that the Old Testament helped the disciple to fashion the figure of the Christ are really reversing the true process, it was the actual historical figure of Jesus that opened the disciples' eyes to the meaning of the Old Testament. An illustration of this fact may be found in the interesting dialogue of Justin Martyr with Trypho. The disciples were so impressed with the personality of Jesus, that they could not read in the Old Testament anything inconsistent with that impression. Just as in the definitions of the creeds the church never attempted to give a rational explanation of her fundamental beliefs, she only said that certain explanations put forth by others were inconsistent with her fundamental beliefs, and the facts on which they were based, so here the disciples read the Old Testament in the light of the whole impression made on them by Jesus. They did not modify or enhance their conception of Him by additions drawn from the Old Testament. On the contrary they rather modified the Old Testament to make it suit the impression made on them by Him.

The supreme supernatural element in Christianity is Christ. If we accept Him there is a natural, scientific, and rational explanation of Christianity. If we accept the estimate of Him expressed in literature by those who knew Him most intimately, then we have a sufficient account and explanation of the origin and character of Christianity. If you do not accept Him as He is set forth in the New Testament you are still face to face with the historical difficulty of accounting for the estimate of Him held by the first generation of Christians, and you have no rational means of accounting for that great movement. What you have to account for is the reversal of human ideals, the substitution of the weak, the despised, for what was esteemed to be honorable, good, and beautiful. You have also to account for the success of the movement, and this is not possible apart from Him

and His abiding influence. You have also to account for the creation of this new ideal.

Were there time I might refer to Harnack's book, "What is Christianity?" and to the works of Loisy. Harnack's idea of Christianity is not that of the Apostles nor is it the Christianity which has turned bad men into good men and sinners into saints. Christianity is not dogma, is not doctrine, though dogma and doctrine are there, it is life from the dead, it is redemption. And that is not found in Harnack's answer to the question, "What is Christianity?" Again, Loisy has a conception of history which confines its operations to that which he can put into a formula. This is common to him and the Ritschlian school, particularly in the later developments of that school. "With regard to the history of religion in particular, people have seemingly failed as yet to realize that the historical science of religious events is wholly different from the religious appreciation of those events; that the doctrinal tradition of the church does not directly represent the real form of its past; that the essential value of the dogmas is not a matter of history; that God is no more a personage of history than He is a physical element of the universe; that His existence is not provable by facts alone, or by reasoning alone, but only by an effort of the moral conscience assisted by knowledge and reasoning; that the divinity of Christ, even if Jesus taught it, would not be a fact of history, but a religious and moral datum of which the certitude is attainable in the same way as that of the existence of God, and therefore, not by a mere discussion of the scriptural evidence," and so on. One is reminded of the old doctrine of faculties, and of the old psychology which allowed a reader to see the working of the faculties and their inter-relations, and never recognized the self who felt, thought, and acted. So Loisy shuts up history into compartments, and will allow no movements outside of his compartments. Thus he insists that the historical science

of religious events is wholly different from the religious appreciation of those events. Well, that raises the whole question of description versus appreciation and of value judgments as against judgments of truth, on which I do not propose to enter, except to say that in the modern school of Pragmatics, as they call themselves, there are no judgments except judgments of appreciation. That the will to believe has the largest share in the production of human beliefs. In which case one side of the antithesis of Loisy, the scientific side, falls to the ground. I take leave to say that all judgments are both scientific and appreciative, though it may depend on the aim in view on which aspect stress is to be laid. It is more important, however, to look at the statement of Loisy, "that God is no more a personage of human history than He is a physical element of the universe." It is a sweeping statement, and if you read history in the light of it you may leave no scope for divine action, no room for revelation, no place for the Incarnation. Reality cannot be put within our categories. Hegel is so far right when he says that the ordinary category of logical contradiction does not apply to the absolute which is also the real. Our Christian theology has to make a similar demand. We have to say, if we are to approach the truth, that God is not a personage in history and that He is a personage in history. We have to say that God is eternal and that He acts in time, that He is immanent in the world and that He transcends the world. We say further that if God has spoken then history may record His word, that if He has acted then history can take note of His deeds. If the word became flesh and dwelt among us, that is as much a fact of history as any other event that has taken place within the bounds of space and time. When Loisy says that the divinity of Christ even if Jesus had taught it would not be a fact of history but a religious and moral datum, then he assumes that a religious and moral datum cannot be a fact of history, a very large assumption in-

deed. History can regard what is unique and exceptional. In fact, it is doing it every day. It is not history that lays down these rules, or lowers things, events, and persons to a dead level, it is simply man's construction of history. If ever any supernatural event did happen, if ever any exceptional person enters into history, then history makes room for him, and his influence enters into the web of it, and his influence makes new possibilities for the race. This we learn from the story of personalities as these have appeared in history.

The New Testament literature has a place in history. You must find what its place is. When you have found for it its place, whatever its place may be in your view, you are face to face with a great problem, the greatest in history. Approach the New Testament literature from any avenue you please, come to it from the Old Testament, from the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature of the Jews, come to it from the current beliefs and expectations of the Jews, and you find yourselves transported into another atmosphere, exalted suddenly to a transcendent height, and you find yourselves in a sphere altogether new. Character, life, conduct are new, ideals have been changed, and indeed reversed, and all this is represented to be the work of one transcendent figure, a figure unique, unlike all others that have gone before, or that have come after. Take Him as real, and you can understand the movement; take Him as built up by the reflection of His followers, and you simply transfer the problem from Him to them, you have not solved it. Then, again, you have a descent as great, or greater than the former ascent, when you pass from the New Testament to subsequent literature. You simply pass out of the sphere of creative ideas into the region of the commonplace. The descent is great, and this also will have to be accounted for. You have the problem of that living literature, literature that from that day to this is productive of life, and life of a special sort. Whence did it come? If

you say that the literature sprang from the creative personality of Jesus Christ, if you say that the life it produces and fosters is derived from Him to-day you have a reasonable and sufficient explanation. On any other terms you have no rational explanation of Christianity as a whole, and as a historical phenomenon which must have its explanation, whatever that explanation may be.

III.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Chapter x: 19 to End.

BY W. T. WHITLEY, M. A., LL.D., PRESTON, ENGLAND.

The last part of this epistle consists of advice pressed upon the readers, to remain true to their principles and not be tempted to slacken and drop back into Judaism. We can afford to compress this greatly in view of our altered circumstances. It will then be possible to compare the general teaching of the epistle with Paul on the one hand, and with the other New Testament authors on the other; to note how the epistle made its way into general circulation, and how it did little to stem a tide of sacerdotalism overwhelming the churches of the third and fourth centuries; and was hardly used in the sixteenth century. This will show how its argument is the very thing needed at the present day to induce a return to Christ as the one Atoning Priest, and what message it has for those who are invited to live a higher life.

“PERSEVERE IN FOLLOWING JESUS.”

“Since we now may enter the temple as priests, and since Jesus ministers there as our High Priest, let us use our privilege of approach, let us be true to the pledge we took in baptism, let us in the approaching crisis maintain our public worship. For if we deliberately abandon Christ, a sin far worse than rejecting Moses, no further sacrifice can be made for such sin, and only punishment can be expected from an outraged God.

“You suffered badly in the past, and did not flinch from avowing yourselves friends of other sufferers. Surely this boldness will not fail you now, when Messiah

is so near, when your fidelity is so nearly crowned with salvation. Only so can you be confident in the certainty of what we wish for, or know that the world as yet unseen has real existence.

“Remember how the saints of old thus looked beyond the visible: Abel had some glimpse of what sacrifice meant, Enoch trusted in the unseen God and went straight to Him, Noah anticipated future judgment and escaped it, Abraham quitted real present prosperity trusting God’s promise of better elsewhere, Sarah against all experience looked for a son and became the mother of a great nation. Yet recollect that in their lifetime these never received what they expected; they trusted God in life and in death, treating as real what they did not yet enjoy.

“Remember too Abraham’s willingness to sacrifice Isaac, the only child, the child of promise; Joseph’s confidence in the inheritance of Canaan; the readiness of Moses to abandon Pharaoh’s court, to seek the invisible God, to trust that the angel of death would pass over the blood-marked houses, to march down into the bed of the sea. Remember the heroes strung to action in the face of apparent failure, or those who faced torture and death expecting God to deliver them. In no case did these men receive here all that they expected, and indeed they await our joining them that at the Second Advent all hopes may be at once fulfilled.

“Shall we then cause grief by giving up the race? Rather fling aside the cumbering robe of Jewish ceremonial with all sin that impedes our course, and steadily run, gazing for inspiration on the victorious Jesus. Compare with Him when you flinch from the battle with sin, or from suffering. He as the true Son of God was chastened to the end; you start back at the first stroke. Think like Him of helping others. Strengthen the weak, reclaim the falling, purge the church of any who are earthly and faithless like Esau.

“The Old Covenant was made for earthly men who needed impressing with outward signs; the New for those who have faith in the reality of heaven. The Old barred men off from God and terrified even Moses; the New invites men near. Jesus is pleading with you in these last hours before He shakes into ruin the old state of things; ere it is too late, take up your heavenly priesthood which shall abide in the new age.

“Keep up brotherly ties, entertain strangers, help prisoners, maintain purity and contentment. Avoid all novel teachings. Are you invited to some sacrificial meal? Christ was slain on the cross as a Sin-offering, after which no sacrificial meal is allowed. Our only altar is the cross; He was thrust outside Judaism. Let us quit it too, and take up our heavenly priesthood, offering praise, kindness, liberality, the only sacrifices that God now accepts.

“Be loyal to the memory of your first leaders and to those who now watch over you; pray for us here, for I hope soon to be restored to you and shall come with Timothy, who is freed already.

“May God who raised from the dead our great Sacrifice to be our chief Pastor, complete His work in us by making us ready to do His will; all that is acceptable to Him can be only through Jesus Christ, to whom be eternal glory. Amen.”

COMPLEMENTARY TO PAUL.

It is natural first for many reasons to compare this teaching in the whole epistle with that of Paul. The most obvious point is that the field occupied is quite different. When Paul wrote to the Thessalonian Gentiles, his themes were of the Resurrection and the Second Coming; such points are here declared to be too elementary for mature Christians. And so throughout the whole range of Paul's letters, the topics that there bulk largely

are here mostly ignored; only at one or two points is it even possible to draw a contrast, generally there is no material for comparison. But three questions were vital in any circle of Christians; Who is Jesus? What did He do for us? How are we saved? To every circle Paul's answers are consistent, even if expressed with greater and greater clearness: He is the Son of God, come down from heaven, who died on the cross for our sins and to excite repentance, who rose again to send forth the Holy Spirit for our salvation; by entrusting ourselves to Him we are instantly pardoned and may appropriate daily grace. But to the circle addressed in this letter the answer is entirely different: He is the Son of God who on earth shared our lot and offered one sacrifice for our sins, in virtue of which He exercises an eternal priesthood of sympathy and help in heaven; our salvation hinges on steadily following in His steps and continuing His work by minor acts of help to others. There is no contradiction here, but scarcely any likeness.

Indeed when we look to details rather than to the whole scope, there is striking independence in the use of the few theological terms common to both. The Old Testament terms are used here much in their old sense. For instance, Faith is defined and illustrated at length by Old Testament examples; it is coupled with virtues such as boldness, confidence, patience, hope; it is contrasted with disappointment and shrinking back. Its advantage is placed not so much at the initial stage as in the later stages of the Christian life. And the quotation from Habakkuk is used in its original sense. Now Paul hardly thought of faith generally, only of faith on Jesus Christ; he associated it with an attribution of righteousness; he contrasted it with an effort after inherent righteousness; in a word he greatly specialized the term, and read into the words of Habakkuk a decidedly new meaning.

Or take the term Sanctify. Here, as generally in the

Bible, it is a ceremonial word, whose root idea is, to set apart from ordinary things and ordinary purposes for God. It is enriched to some extent, but it remains on the whole external and ritual, at deepest signifying, to put in right relation with God. Now when Paul wants to express this idea, he discards the term sanctify, and chooses another, from a legal vocabulary; his term Justify, though not absolutely equivalent, yet means broadly what sanctify means here; while into sanctify Paul reads a deep ethical meaning, taking note of the fact that he who is put into right relation with God will by degrees acquire the character of God.

When Paul discussed the Law, he thought chiefly of its moral side; here only the sacerdotal section is dealt with. When the ex-Pharisee Paul had anything to do with a high-priest, it was with an unjust judge whom he branded as a whited wall; in these pages the actual high-priest is ignored, and the ancient ideal in Aaron is considered. In most of his epistles Paul has a hard grip on the realities of life, and deals with flesh-and-blood adversaries; this teaching is highly ideal, and the advice is decidedly impersonal. When Paul quotes the Scriptures, he cites the Law and argues like a pupil of Gamaliel; here the psalms and prophets are dwelt upon and expounded with striking novelty. Of course, a writer who knew Timothy, probably knew also Paul according to the flesh, but when he wrote like this he was no learner in the school of Paul; if he shows that he had read a few of Paul's letters, he was original enough to strike out a line completely independent.

KINSHIP WITH OTHER AUTHORS.

When we turn to other letters which survive to us, we find two from the brothers, James and Jude, dealing distinctly with Jews, two from Peter and three from John dealing with a wide and different circle, including

Asia. Apparently a comparison with James and Jude should be the more promising.

Yet James looks on a far more primitive state of Christianity, when those who held to the old Way and those who saw in Jesus the Hope of Israel could still meet in the same synagogue. He still deals with elementary doctrine such as the necessity for a good life, he objects to the rush to teach, he urges a simple patient life on the lines advised in the Sermon on the Mount. At first sight there appears little in common. But when we recognize that our epistle subordinates advice to doctrine about Jesus, which is markedly absent in James, we can yet see a continuity. Both have the same conception of faith, and draw illustrations from the same people, Abraham and Rahab. Advice to immature Christians not to teach is quite harmonious with advice to them a generation later to rise up and teach. The silence of James about that temple where he himself worshiped daily, readily develops in twenty years into a formal exposition that its system is obsolete. The general sense that the Judge is at the door becomes urgent in the last call, while yet you hear "To-day." The invitation to intercessory prayer and to efforts for the conversion of others, leads to the remark that these alike are duties for every Christian priest. In brief, the theology of this epistle is that of James, highly enriched and supplemented, whereas that of James could never have developed into that of Paul. Even the short note of Jude has its point of contact, in the interest shown as to the angels.

And when we turn to Peter, we find the central point of this epistle approached when he not only quotes and says that all Christians are now the true "holy priesthood," but explains that we are to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. This phrase even implies what he does not explicitly assert, **that** Jesus is Priest; he rather dwells on the sacrifice, and repeats that He is the Shepherd of souls, while he evinces

an interest in the doings of Christ after death. And besides other coincidences both of thought and word, we find Peter alarmed at the prospect of Christians relapsing into their former state.

The epistles of John have hardly any points of contact for comparison. But in the Revelation there are some suggestive phrases such as, He made us to be priests; and much of the imagery is drawn from the temple, with its altar, its sanctuary where the martyrs officiate, its golden altar where arises the incense of the saints' prayers, its outer court which may be frequented by the unconverted, the ark of the covenant. Yet there is the most emphatic repudiation of an actual sacrificial system, for in the new Jerusalem there is no temple.

The result of this comparison is to show that the epistle to the Hebrews stands alone in seizing and developing one great line of thought, although congruous allusions are found in the writings of James, Peter and John. It may be summarily added that the appeal to prophecy is found also in Matthew; that although similarity of language with Luke has been asserted, Plummer has shown there are only five trifling words in both authors besides what are found in Paul or in the Septuagint; that in allegorical method and in ideal philosophy there are traces of the influence of Plato, possibly filtered through Philo of Alexandria.

READERS AND WRITER.

The enquiry, "Who wrote and who received the letter?" is fascinating, but unprofitable. At most, we can hope to say who stood in need of it, and who were capable of writing it.

The title "Hebrews" was of course given by some editor; it is very doubtful whether he guessed right. The word means strictly. Jews who lived in Palestine; but these largely spoke Aramaic, whereas this letter is in

Greek, and always was. Doubtless there were semi-Greek towns like Cesarea; but apart from the editorial title, nothing would suggest such a community. If the title be neglected, we can see that the letter would appeal to any Jews whose knowledge of the temple service was literary, who knew not the actual temple in Jerusalem, but the rules in Leviticus for the tabernacle. Where can we imagine a circle of Jews, all speaking Greek, turned Christian, and not in touch with Jerusalem? None of the churches founded by Paul can possibly suit, and we know very little about others. But from his epistle to the Romans we find that an exceptional state of things prevailed in Rome; instead of one church organized for the whole city, there were several little groups connected with Prisca and Aquila, Aristobulus, Narcissus, Asyncretus, Philologus. At a later stage when Paul wrote to the Philippians from Rome he found the Jewish group almost a distinct faction, still priding itself on being the Circumcision. When he called Timothy to his side again in Rome, he had to do with some people who were ever learning, but were never able to arrive at knowledge of the truth, which indeed they withstood, being reprobate concerning the faith; and except for a few people previously unknown, he was deserted by all but Luke, all others flinching from his side at the trial. Apparently then the Jewish Christians converted at Pentecost by Peter had, at the later date, clustered round Prisca and Aquila, but in their absence had drifted into opposition to Paul and his school; to such a group this letter might come with great appropriateness. And a Gentile editor might easily style the recipients "Hebrews" if an Englishman calls Kentuckians "Yankees." But while we thus see a possible destination, we must remember that such a company might easily arise in towns not known to us.

To ascertain a possible writer, we had better study the movements of Timothy as disclosed in Paul's last letter,

and in his previous letters during his first captivity. When he wrote to the Colossians, Timothy was with him; when he expected acquittal, he intended to send Timothy to Philippi. But this epistle shows Timothy only just freed. Therefore this epistle does not belong to the time of the first captivity. When Paul was actually going to Macedonia, he left Timothy at Ephesus as his temporary deputy to set things right; but the task was too hard, and Tychicus was sent to replace him, while he was summoned to Paul's side at Rome. Now there is nothing to show that this journey was ever completed, or was even begun; the Ephesians were annoyed at Jews and Christians alike, and though Tychicus of Asia might be safe there, the circumcised Timothy was not. Quite possibly he was arrested there, but released owing to his unimportance when once Paul was dead.

Now when Paul last wrote to him at Ephesus he bade him convey greetings to Prisca and Aquila; is it possible that one or both of these wrote this anonymous letter? She was apparently a Roman, he a Jew of Pontus. Exiled from their home in Rome, they settled for a while at Corinth and Ephesus, where they employed Paul in their workshop. They were the pioneers at Ephesus, and were well enough educated to teach even the learned Apollos.

If then we limit ourselves to places and people mentioned in the New Testament, all conditions seem met by Prisca and Aquila writing about 69 A. D. to the little circle of Jews in Rome that once met in their house. But the letter may be due to people and circumstances of whom we have no knowledge.

RECEPTION OF THE EPISTLE.

When we look to see how the letter was received in different quarters, we find a curious hesitation in attending to it. It was soon known at Rome, where Clement and Hermas used it, without formally referring to it;

fifty or sixty years later Justin showed acquaintance with it. But when, about 200 A. D., Hippolytus or some one else drew up a formal list of books useful for public reading in Italy, known to us as the Muratorian Canon, this book was utterly ignored, and did not even receive condemnation. Across at Carthage about the same time, Tertullian knew and approved it, because of its apparent sternness to apostates, but startles us by attributing it to Barnabas as if this authorship were well known, though no one else alludes to this. It is most significant that he expressly distinguished it from writings of authority among Christians; and his disciple, Cyprian, ignored it.

In Asia we find that Marcion, the first to publish a collection of Christian literature, made no use of this; though indeed his doctrinal leanings would induce him to pass it over. Irenæus of Lyons, who largely represents the traditions of Asia, also neglected it. But Pinytus of Crete, a little earlier, showed acquaintance with it.

In Syria it met no recognition. The "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," apparently a manual for Jewish-Christian churches, did not use it. When Tatian returned from Rome and gave the Syrian churches some books in their own tongue, this was not among them; nor did it receive recognition till the fifth century under Greek influence.

In Egypt, the home of allegory, the epistle was known to the Sicilian Jew, Pantænus, who regarded it as Paul's work. His successors faithfully repeated this opinion, but departed from it; for Clement conjectured that Paul wrote in Hebrew, while Luke made the Greek version; Origen went further and thought that Luke or Clement of Rome was the author, on the basis of thoughts originated by Paul.

The authority of these Egyptian scholars induced the Eastern Greek churches to use the epistle on the understanding that it was Paul's. Further east, and in the West, there was no such understanding, and no such practice till the fifth century. The Arian Goths do not

seem to have had the letter in their version, it was hardly used in Gaul, Italy and Africa until after earnest debates in which Augustine advocated it, and then it only came in as an appendix to Paul's epistles. Pope Innocent advised its use, but Jerome's opinion that it was not Paul's caused Latin copyists to vary greatly in the place they gave it, even if they included it at all; not until the standard edition by Alcuin in 800 was its status sure. A few Greek copies of Paul's letters made even later still omitted it. But it never was classed with the seven Catholic epistles, with some of which it has real affinity.

In other words, it never was regarded as canonical scripture except on the assumption that it was Paul's work, or on papal authority.

RISE OF SACERDOTALISM.

If outwardly not very much attention was paid to the epistle in early days, still less was its great teaching appreciated. The question soon arose, How is the church related to the Jewish nation, the New Covenant to the Old? To this many answered, especialy Marcion, that the whole of the old system was bad, so that the Old Testament was worthless for the Christian. A natural reaction was to assert that there was perfect continuity, that the surviving Jews might be neglected, and that the church was grafted on to the old stock; this made the Old Testament authoritative. The answer of this epistle was that the Jewish system had been full of intentional forecasts of the truth, derived indeed from a glimpse of the eternal truth; thus everything sacerdotal had prepared for Christ being recognized as the sole Priest; and that now the real thing had come, the anticipations were obsolete.

This lesson was never understood, and the sacerdotal language of the Old Testament was adopted in a muddled figurative sense by Clement of Rome, who in one place

called Christ the High Priest, in another implied that church officers were priests, and that other Christians were laymen. When we scan the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp in the second century, we find a solitary reference to a literal pagan high priest of Asia, and a few merely figurative allusions to priests and sacrifices. These set forth that all Christians are in the precinct of the altar, that all are priests under Christ the High Priest, that a man going to death is an offering to God; while vehement opposition is shown to the Jews and their ritual system. This antagonism was continued by Aristides, and by Justin debating with a Jew; but Justin used some highly ambiguous language about the bread and wine of communion as a sacrifice. The same confusion of thought is to be traced in Tertullian.

Indeed in these early writers we see the three great influences destined to transform the simple Christian service into a highly sacerdotal one, despite the plain warnings of this epistle: Pagan surroundings, Jewish precedent, thoughtless rhetoric.

Notice first the general usage of the whole pagan world with its system of priests, altars, sacrifices. At Rome were ancient fanes of gods such as Jupiter and Vesta, with pontiffs and vestal virgins. At Athens was the Parthenon with its idol of Pallas Athene. At Ephesus was the splendid temple to Diana with its hideous image and its troop of priests. No town but had, like Lystra, at least one temple where priests were ready to sacrifice oxen to their god. And the emperors encouraged a new set of temples to their predecessors or themselves; and they enlisted the chief men of each province to form a new Imperial Priesthood, meeting annually at large towns like Lyons. To every Greek or Roman, religion implied a temple with an altar where a priest slew a sacrifice. As soon as Christianity became important enough to challenge serious refutation, a philosopher made it one count in his indictment that there were no

temples and no sacrifices. When Origen replied to Celsus about 250, he granted the fact, and defended it; but when a century later it became fashionable to profess the religion patronized by the emperor, the pagan customs were sure to press for naturalization.

For this the way had been prepared by a movement within Christian bounds, a recrudescence of the Jewish feelings brought about by unintelligent adoption of all the Jewish sacred books. Before the second century closed, appeared the Clementine Homilies, a religious novel written deliberately to propagate the Jewish-Christian views, especially insinuating that Christianity was absolutely continuous with the old system. Certainly an exact restoration was not openly advocated, but salvation was ascribed to the due performance of rites or the abstinence from certain viands, and a single head of the church on earth was put forward, to the first of whom even the apostles used to report. At the time the movement was generally condemned, but it was only premature, and presently won its way. Of this we can take three instances.

Thus, the scriptural doctrine of one only sacrifice for sin, long remained unimpeached in words, but its foundations were sapped. Origen actually misused this very epistle to assert that martyrdom was a continuation of the crucifixion, and was a sacrifice offered by the blameless priest. Tertullian went further, and spoke not only of martyrdom, but of holiness in general, or in particular of fasting, virginity, marital continence, as being able to expiate for sin. Cyprian expanded the hints and ascribed atoning power to penitence, tears, almsgiving, intercession. Then came in the other tributary of evil, the lax use of figurative language. Rhetoricians had talked about the water of baptism as though it were the blood of Christ, about the bread and wine as though they were the body and blood of Christ. Cyprian improved on this and spoke of the blood of Christ being offered in sacri-

fice at the Lord's Supper. So the emphasis in the communion service was shifted; once it had been a thanksgiving to God for redemption, a Eucharist; or a Communion with God and with one another; or a Memorial of the one sacrifice; now it became a repetition of that sacrifice.

Or again, it was long borne in mind that all Christians were priests; the fact was emphasized in the arrangements of public worship, when those who were not yet baptized were not permitted to join in the priestly thanksgiving service, wherein all Christians took part. But again a trick of language worked harm, and in the west the term *Sacerdos* was applied to the officers of the church, a term which in pagan circles meant a sacrificing priest. And although the New Testament never used the corresponding term *Hiereus* for a Christian minister, the Greeks employed it. Before long Tertullian found it necessary to protest that all laymen were priests—but the protest was futile—while in the same breath he admitted that there was a priestly order distinguished from the mass of the Christian people. And in a code of ecclesiastical laws reflecting the customs of perhaps 250 A. D., we have bishops spoken of as priests ministering at the altar. And so the general priesthood of all believers fell rapidly into the background and was practically denied, while the clergy styled themselves *Sacrificing Priests*.

Or once more, when Christians first began erecting buildings for worship, they did not copy temples, whether Jewish or pagan, but put up plain assembly-rooms with reading desk, chair, wooden table, these they called Houses of Prayer, or the Lord's Places. They were jeered at as having neither temple nor altar, and they gloried in the fact. But in a few centuries opinion changed, the building was divided up on the analogy of the Jewish temple, with an outer compartment for the mere laity, but for the priests an inner part containing the holy table. Nor did the declension stop there. In the east the furniture of the altar came to include an ark, a seven-branched

candlestick, a censer, a table of shewbread; and the whole of these articles were hidden from the laity by a screen, as if once again the veil were hung to cut off all but priests from direct access to God. In the west the table was replaced by a stone altar, while images of wood, stone and metal were introduced into worship.

In all these respects we see that the doctrine of this epistle was utterly neglected. In place of the one High Priest and the priesthood of all believers depending on Him, arose hundreds of men claiming the title but excluding their brethren. In place of the one and only atoning sacrifice arose a daily repetition of it by the priest, and a series of supplementary meritorious sacrifices by the laymen. In place of the heavenly temple were built earthly temples replete with symbolical furniture. These innovations fitted together admirably and fatally, bringing back a general Jewish legalism that almost extinguished the gospel.

On one side this system was attacked in the spirit of Paul by Martin Luther, and the reformation ensuing left many churches free from the error of justification by works. But most of them clung to a modified sacerdotalism, and into some of them have crept back the whole series of errors as to sacrifice and priests, illustrated by the form of their buildings, the plan of their services, the attire of their leaders.

PERTINENCE TO-DAY.

The author of the epistle would indeed be startled to see the position to-day. The sort of people for whom he wrote expressly, the class which then seemed so important, the Christian Jews, has simply disappeared; trying to bridge the gulf between Jews and Christians they fell in, rejected by both. Then on the one hand the Jews at large have dropped their temple and their sacrifices, and do not seem to regret them; they only take note of their

priests as certifying to the purity of their meat, as giving the closing benediction at worship, and as limited to virgin wives. But on the other hand, Gentile Christians have appropriated the relics discarded by the Jews, and have decked themselves out therewith. So the argument of the epistle is as keen and pertinent to-day as ever it was. What better proof can be needed of its inspiration, or of its right to stand among the sacred books of our faith?

How comes it that a book, apparently so adapted to one particular occasion and one limited class of readers, is yet so up-to-date? The answer is important. The human heart craves a priest, a mediator between God and man; conscience cries out for a sacrifice which shall atone for sin. When the Priesthood of Christ, and the worth of His sacrifice are depreciated, they will invent something additional to satisfy the craving. But the ground is nearly cut from under the feet of these modern sacerdotalists by attention to the doctrine of this epistle, and by reliance on Christ as our atoning Priest.

One piece of symbolism deserves close attention, the arrangement of the tabernacle. As prescribed in Exodus, there were three portions; the court open to all priests for cleansing and sacrifice; the outer room of the building screened by a veil, open only to a priest on a special duty; the inner room screened by a second veil, open to the High Priest alone.

When now in this epistle we look for any mention of the court with its laver and altar, or of the veil that parted it from the outer room, we find frequent reminders that the one sacrifice has been offered, so that the altar has been abolished, and only the laver remains for use. The first veil is nowhere treated as existing, but the outer room, once hidden from most priests, seems now thrown open to them all, and they are urged to draw nigh and enter into the Holy Place. With this is contrasted the Holy of Holies, and attention is drawn to the fact that even yet the way into the inmost room is not open. With-

in that Holy of Holies is Jesus, the High Priest, and still the second veil hangs between Him and us. This separation is not permanent. He is our forerunner, and some day He will reappear, a consummation to be earnestly desired, since it will complete our salvation and will be to usher us with the earlier saints into the immediate presence of God. Meantime we are promoted from the disused altar, to the candlestick, the table, the golden altar of incense.

To interpret this symbolism. With making atonement we have nothing to do; Christ has done that and thereby has consecrated a new order of priesthood to serve Him. Our side of this is to take up our rights and consecrate ourselves once for all, then to cleanse ourselves daily for His service in heart and soul. Our service includes letting our light shine before men that they may see our good works and glorify God, bringing gifts and offerings, presenting prayer and praise. But while we are in the flesh we can see neither God nor even His Mediator Jesus Christ; our salvation is incomplete and our service is not of the highest type; we may hope for better things, but cannot in the flesh enjoy them. Meanwhile we are tempted and often sin, we need mercy, grace and help, He lives separated from sinners and apart from sin. Into that loftiest state we may be promoted when He appears.

Thus we have two doctrines which are to-day of the utmost importance—one, that all Christians alike are priests; the other, that our priesthood is inferior to His not only by lacking atoning power, but also in its being exercised subject to the disabilities of the flesh. These deserve stating anew in language freed somewhat from tabernacle symbolism, when it will be seen that they do not depend solely on this epistle, but might be elicited also from the writings of Paul, Peter and John.

Every Christian has privileges not open directly to the mass of mankind. A life of good deeds is acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. The time, thought and money

that we devote to His service will be recognized and rewarded by Him. Prayer in the name of Jesus will be heard and answered. Such privileges are also duties; required from us. But men who know the claims and offers of Christ, yet neglect them and venture to rely on their works or gifts or life, and who plead on any basis other than that of His love shown through Christ, are intruding where they have no right. There is another series of duties owed by Christians toward fellow-men; to urge repentance, explain the way of salvation, assure of forgiveness to those who trust Christ, enlist others into His service. Such obligations are implied in the promise, "Whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Church officers have no interest more than others in this promise. Every Christian equally has direct access to God, every Christian equally has service to render to men.

While thus we all have been raised to a higher platform than before Christ died, nevertheless it is not yet the highest we may reach. We are on earth, He is in heaven; and this distinction maintains a difference which can only disappear when He calls quick and dead alike to share in the higher life where sin is abolished and temptation ceases. Meantime we are still hampered with a sinful nature with which we have always to reckon, and are often betrayed into actual sins both of neglect and of deed and of thought, for which we must seek daily pardon. We are enjoined not to be satisfied with this halfway stage, and rather to anticipate the final stage and seek to reach up towards it; but we have not yet attained to it, and cannot in this life.

THE KINGSHIP OF JEHOVAH.

BY REV. WILLIAM ASHMORE, D. D., WALLASTON, MASS.

Human governments are a growth. First: There were families. Families multiplied and became tribes. Tribes were united and became nations. The unifying energy may sometimes have been self interest, but more frequently it was force. There were master minds among men who forged ahead to the front and became leaders among men. Some of them were city builders, like those who founded Babel and Nineveh and Rehobeth and Calah; and some of them were conquerors, like Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord. There was one common characteristic of these major and minor sovereignties. They were all of them absolutely autocratic. Pharaoh's commission to Joseph was a fine illustration of the absolutism of all those nations of ancient times. "Without thee shall no man lift up his hand or his foot in all the land of Egypt." Another example was presented in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, "all people, nations and languages, trembled and feared before him, whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive, and whom he would he set up, and whom he would he put down." Representative bodies among those nations there were not. Participation in the government, there was none. Constitutionalism there was none.

Jehovah was now about to give to mankind a new ideal in government. He was to inaugurate the beginning of civil liberty. He was to furnish them a constitution and by-laws. He was to allow them to have a voice in their own affairs, and he was to allow them to vote on the acceptance of their king. It is to be noted as a fact in human history that the first suggestion of a purely democratic or popular government under safe and sane limitations was never known among mankind until it was intro-

duced by Jehovah himself in the commonwealth of Isreal. All popular governments ever since emanated from that one precedent.

Jehovah had an old covenant made with Abraham in reference to what he was now about to do. The covenant lay seemingly neglected, and, as Israel thought, completely forgotten by Jehovah. But not until now had the time come. Jehovah was now come down to deliver them, and to take them to himself. He was to exercise toward them, and over them, all the functions of a great and beneficent sovereign. The whole procedure is marked by the strictest diplomatic form known to the children of men.

He would not force himself upon them, nor would he ask them to take him on mere trust in advance. The events which transpired from the time Jehovah came down to deliver them down to the covenant at the foot of Sinai, were all of them of the nature of evidences of his power and fitness to rule. He broke off the chains of bondage, he plagued their enemies, he scourged them with pestilence, he swallowed them up in the sea, he brought Israel with a high hand out of Egypt. He gave them manna from heaven, and water out of the flinty rock. He sweetened the bitter waters, he covered them with his canopy of clouds from the heat of the desert sun, he lighted their pathway at night by a pillar of fire, and all this before he asked them to accept him as a king at all. Was not this evidence enough that he was able to do what he had undertaken, and, therefore, they would make no mistake in accepting him? Jehovah himself appeals to this evidence. "Ye have seen what I did, what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings and brought you unto myself." And then he went on to make an offer of himself to be their king. "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice and keep my covenant, etc." Ex. 19, 4, 6.

Moses hurried down from the mount. He assembled the elders—the official body of the people—and the people themselves, and laid before them the proposition of Jeho-

vah. It was accepted in full, with heartiness. It was what is technically known as a democratic vote that was called for; that is, a vote of the entire body of the people; it was given accordingly, and all the people answered, "ALL that the Lord God hath spoken we will do." Note that they said, "We will *do*" it. It was a covenant of works that was now being made. A covenant not merely of hearing, and believing, but of *doing*. Every man pledged himself personally to do and to obey. On the strength of their own doing and obeying they were now to enter into the promised land. This feature of the situation must be kept in mind in order to apprehend what is now to come. Ex. 19, 7, 9.

The preliminaries were thus completed. The people had verbally given in their adhesion. The time had come for the next step, and the Lord said unto Moses: "Go unto the people and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow and be ready by the third day." They were to get washed up and cleaned up and made respectable enough to be taken into the presence of the great king from whom they had already received so much favor, and from whom they expected so much more. They were now to have an experience with that awful majesty of which they knew so little. The base of the mountain was to be fenced off and roped in all round, lest the people should get within the danger zone. Ex. 19, 10-13.

And it came to pass in the third day in the morning that there were thunders and lightnings and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people in the camp trembled. Sinai was all a-tremble and a-smoke because the Lord descended upon them in fire, and the smoke arose as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. The people had to be held back, lest, in a frantic craze, they should break through the barrier and perish. In their fright they began to entreat Moses, "Speak thou with us, and we will hear thee, but let not God speak with us, lest we

die." So they stood trembling afar off. So terrible was the sight that Moses said, "I exceedingly fear and tremble." Ex. 19, 16-25.

These terms and conditions are contained in Ex. 20-23, all of which appear to have been communicated at one time and in one connection. They include, however, two distinct codes, sustaining to each other much such a relation as exists between a constitution and by-laws with us. The one fixed and unalterable and the other of a mobile character, subject to modification and change. It does not appear that the distribution was made on the mount at the time it was first spoken, but was made later by Jehovah himself. They are called "The Words and the Judgments."

I. The ten words, or, as we call them, the Ten Commandments, are contained in Chap. 20. They are purely religious and ethical. They express the law of religion towards God, and the law of morality towards men. They are a transcript to the Divine Nature, and cannot be abbreviated, or superseded, or changed in any way, because in order to set this forth, God with his own finger wrote the ten words on to stone.

II. The Judgments. "Now these are the judgments which thou shalt set before them." They are contained in Chaps. 21, 22 and 23. They set forth the rules and principles of conduct which Jehovah requires them to observe in various relations and conditions of society. The judgments, like by-laws, may be altered, or amended, or suspended, as may be required.

As it appears from the narrative, Moses waited on God at the close of the great audience and received these words and judgments orally. Aaron and Nadab and Abihu and seventy of the elders of Israel accompanied him part way, but were commanded to worship afar off, while Moses alone came near to Jehovah to receive details. Then Moses came back again to the people. He reported to them all the words of the Lord and all the judgments,

and now with one voice the people answered: "All the words which the Lord hath said will we *do*." So far so good. The treaty was making progress. He then gave them a night to think it over. He himself went to his tent and wrote down all that the Lord had spoken. Next day he rose up early and builded an altar. Then he sent "Young men to offer burnt-offerings." He took the blood and had it ready in vessels. He then read what he had written the night before, in the order he had received them, and gave them an opportunity to say whether, after a night's deliberation, they still agree to it. A third time the people said, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." The document thus prepared was called "The Book of the Covenant." It was to be then their charter of redemption. It was their fee simple to the land of Canaan. It was their oath of fealty to Jehovah their king. By virtue of its warrant they were to now enter in and possess the land and start on their career as a nation. Moses took part of the blood and sprinkled the book. That represented the sealing on God's part, binding him to the performance of his part. Then he sprinkled the blood on the people, thus affixing their seal. As he did so he said practically, "Behold the blood of the Covenant by which the Lord herewith binds you also." And now once more Moses with a copy of this blood-sealed document went up in the mount to exchange ratifications with God. Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu are sent along as representatives of the people. This time they were allowed to approach near to God. A treaty of amity was concluded. It is always a joyous time when a great treaty is concluded and ratifications are exchanged. This was to be no exception. God received them in open court, face to face. They saw the God of Israel, they saw the sapphire pavement under his feet as the body of heaven in its clearness. They saw God and did eat and drink and were not afraid.

Another thing remained of vast importance. Moses

was told to come himself higher up in the mountain. His minister Joshua was to come up with him, but Aaron and Hur and the elders were to wait, and he said, "Tarry ye here until we come again to you. And behold Aaron and Hur with you. If any man have any matters to do, let him come unto them." Moses seemed to have had some premonition that there was much work for him to do and that he would be a long time in the mountain. With this injunction to them he went up into the mountain and disappeared in the clouds. The clouds covered him six days, but over it all in dazzling brilliance the effulgence of the divine glory was like devouring fire on the top of the mountain.

Since Jehovah was to be their king he must have a palace. In this case it was to be a tent like their own. He must have a retinue of servants, and he must have an order of service. These must all be on a lofty and elaborate scale. Jehovah would furnish the design, but the people must furnish the material and put the parts together. This involved many details of construction, and in consequence, Moses must needs be a long time in the mount, studying the pattern shown him. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering, every man that giveth willingly with his heart, and let them make me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them." And so from Chaps. 25 to 31 of Exodus, seven full chapters in all, the kind of material called for is dwelt upon; the mode of construction, the various implements of service, and the ceremonies and rituals suitable to a royal court are all elaborated.

All at once Jehovah said to Moses, "Get thee down, for the people which thou broughtest up out of the land of Egypt have corrupted themselves. They have made them a calf and have worshiped it." Such language, "the people which thou hast brought up," implied repudiation. After a few words of despairing entreaty with God, Moses

gathered up the two tables of testimony and hurried down to the camp. It was even so. He saw the calf and the debased crowd dancing naked before it. In the heat of his anger he threw down to the ground his two tables of stone and they were broken to pieces. The covenant was broken, absolutely broken, abrogated and set aside. All that had been done was now undone. God was under no treaty obligation to take them to the land of Canaan.

A new covenant was made, but it was not a renewal of that *first* covenant. The outlook at this time was appalling. In the fury of his indignation Moses went at Aaron. Aaron excused himself, pleading that he had to yield to the vehemence of the people, and threw also some blame on Moses for being gone so long. Moses gathered the sons of Levi around him and they dashed into the mutinous crowd. Soon they made the camp a slaughter pen. After this tumultuous scene was over, and after he had allowed them a night to think over the situation, on the morrow, after the people had come to their senses, he said to them, "Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord, if peradventure I shall make an atonement for you.

He did go and he did make the atonement, but it was at a terrible cost to himself. He returned to the Lord and began his piteous begging for forgiveness, "Oh, these people have sinned a great sin and have made themselves gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written." These words contain the only unfinished sentence in the Bible. Spare them and take me, that's what it means. If you will not spare them, and if it must be, take me in their place. God took him at his word. Moses was doomed. Moses would be taken if they were left. Moses would have to die before they could ever enter into the land of promise. In this Moses was a type of Christ. He did for carnal Israel what Christ has done for spiritual Israel.

With this prayer of Moses Jehovah now made up with his people. The change in his manner was instantaneous and complete. "Therefore, now go and lead the people to the place of which I have spoken to thee." Observe Jehovah's speech here, he does not say "*thy* people" any more, but "*the* people," thus again accepting a partnership in them. "Behold, mine angel shall go before thee." The alienation was now over. Sinai was behind, Zion was ahead. Law was satisfied, the reign of grace had now begun.

The accompaniments of the second institution of this covenant were in direct contrast to those attendant on the first. Then the covenant had been made with the house of Jacob and the children of Israel. They all stood for themselves. Ex. 19, 3. Now it was made "with *thee* and with Israel," that is, with the children of Israel *in Moses*. Ex. 34, 27. In this the covenant of grace was conforming in its attitude to the eternal covenant made with Christ first and then with his people *in Christ*. Psalm 89, 19, 37. In the one case the entourage was fire and smoke, reverberating thunder, forked lightnings and a reeling mountain; in the other it was all gentleness. In the one case they went up into the midst of the thick darkness; in the other case God returned the call, and stood and talked with Moses face to face before his tent as a man talketh to his friend.

The change in the manner of Jehovah was so marked in its cordiality that Moses became bold and venturesome. God's method of doing things was an engima to him. It seemed inconsistent with itself. He had lashed their oppressors in Egypt with judgments, and now he seemed ready to destroy them himself. Moses sought an explanation. "Lord, I beseech thee, show me thy way," show me thy way of doing things. Show me on what principles you proceed, that I may know what to expect, and how to act as a leader of thy people. Being further encouraged, Moses said, "Show me thy glory," that is, "What con-

stitutes the glory of your character? What is it you prize most of all in the estimate of yourself?" It was a daring request, but God condescended to give him a gracious answer. He said, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee."

Great potentates, when they take their places on the seats of authority and honor to which they have been called, make to their subjects an opening address, or what we call an inaugural. This address is supposed to be a statement of the principles and the policy of the party in power. To this usage Jehovah now conformed himself. He was their king under a covenant of grace. He, therefore, started out with a proclamation that at once set forth the attributes of his personality and at the same time the principles on which he should administer his government for all coming time. In a cleft of the rock, with God's hand over him, to shield him from the fierceness of the dazzling glory, and through the spaces between God's fingers, Moses could see the ineffable splendor as it passed by, and could hear the reverberation of that glorious and fearful name, "The Lord Thy God."

JEHOVAH, JEHOVAH GOD. MEROIFUL AND GRACIOUS, LONG-SUFFERING, AND ABUNDANT IN GOODNESS AND TRUTH, KEEPING MERCY FOR THOUSANDS, FORGIVING INIQUITY, TRANSGRESSION, AND SIN, AND WILL BY NO MEANS CLEAR THE GUILTY; VISITING THE INIQUITIES OF THE FATHER UPON THE CHILDREN AND UPON THE CHILDREN'S CHILDREN, UNTO THE THIRD AND FOURTH GENERATION.

While this declaration of the significance of God's name satisfied some of the perplexities of Moses, it introduced others, which he could not then comprehend, for God had said, "Forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin," and then added in the same breath, "and will by no means clear the guilty." How could both these things coexist? He will, and yet he won't. He won't, and yet he will. The mystery is solved in the seventeenth chapter of John.

That chapter is an antitype of the present one. The proclamation of God's name was a shadow and a prediction. The real proclamation of God's name took place when Christ passed up and down before the land for the space of three years, making all his goodness pass before men. Christ illustrated what it was for God to be merciful and gracious, to forgive iniquity, transgression, and sin. Christ's own words evidently point back to this very scene in which Moses was a participant. He says: "I have manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world." But though he had illustrated several syllables of the name, there was one that he had not spelled out. At the close of his address to God he said, "I have declared thy name, and will declare it." There was one thing more for him to do. He was to show how God would by no means clear the guilty. He himself on the morrow was to give himself up as a ransom. The words which he uses evidently refer to something immediately at hand. That something could only be his crucifixion.

Now that the chasm was bridged over, and now that the king had delivered his address from the throne, it was proper to resume the preparations for the pavilion, which was to be built for God. Much progress had been made, as we learn from the twenty-fifth chapter and onward, but now it had all to be gone over again. This explains the seeming "repetitiousness," as some undiscerning critics have called it, of chapter thirty-five following chapter twenty-five. The criticism is made by those who seem to be ignorant of diplomatic form and of Oriental usage. When a main treaty is broken, all the minor steps fall with it. If a new treaty is made, the specifications have to be repeated. This explains why the giving of the material and the work of construction is repeated a second time. The tabernacle procedure, beginning with the twenty-fifth chapter, was a part of the Covenant of Works, now abrogated. The collection of material men-

tioned in the thirty-fifth chapter and onward to the end of Exodus, was a part of the Covenant of Grace.

Three books of the Pentateuch, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, while they contain a history of the people of Israel during their desert life, contain also what is more germane to our present consideration, a portraiture of the character and the ways of their king. These three books are a practical commentary on the royal proclamation by Jehovah, which attendeth the institution of the Covenant of Grace. Ex. 34. Jehovah appears all the way through as a sovereign just and righteous and merciful, and yet absolute in all matters of state and matters of religion.

I. He issues definite instructions about his pavilion that is to be erected. He himself furnishes all the specifications with the greatest minuteness of detail.

II. He names all the officers of his court and prescribes all the duties that are to be discharged by each one. Aaron and Joshua and Bezaleel and Aholiab are all his appointees. Moses was the great prophet, Aaron was the great priest, and Joshua was the great general. All of these persons received their commissions direct from God.

III. He prescribes the way he is to be served by all who would approach him. There is a system of offerings and of sacrifices and of sacred festivals, all of them being typical of things to come. The whole burnt-offering contained in the first chapter of Leviticus represents Christ giving himself in his entirety as an offering for sin. The meat-offering in the second chapter of Leviticus represents Christ as an offering of righteousness for his people, and the peace-offering in the third chapter of Leviticus represents Christ being made a feast of reconciliation between God and man.

IV. While Jehovah governs by a deputy and a mediator, he himself is always at hand for reference and for appeal.

V. Their king was not only their political head and their religious head, but he was also their military leader. As such he marked out their campaign of conquest. He ordered the sending forth of the spies. He numbered those fit for war and located them in their camps and under their banners, and he devised all their strategies for them.

What impression did these new subjects of Jehovah get of their king? There were certain persons among them who were what the Scriptures call "profane persons," with proclivities for wrong-doing, who were prone to evil continually. Their conception of Jehovah was unspiritual and unworthy. He was a great God, a mighty God, a shelter and a hiding-place, but they never could appreciate either his spirituality or his holiness. There were other persons again in ancient Israel just as there afterwards were in Christ's day, and just as there are now, who come to the light that their deeds may be manifest, and who with a seeming instinct seemed to take kindly to the truth.

The history of the reign of Jehovah as king began with the thirty-second chapter of Exodus and it includes also the books Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges, and I Samuel down to Chap. 10, when the people rejected him and wanted a human king of their own. Thirty-eight years of that reign had passed already, but though they were a nation of subjects, they had no kingdom territory; they were in search of one. Joshua and Judges are called the Books of the Theocratic Régime proper, because God was now king over them in the land he had promised them; and because they were now in the kingdom land the administration of their king took on new features. To these new features attention is now to be directed. Moses himself was dead. Jehovah had removed him in accordance with the declaration recorded in Ex. 32, "When I visit I will visit." His life for theirs. His life had been mortgaged for thirty-eight years. Now

God foreclosed so that the people might go in and take possession. The official and the legal character of the transaction was manifested from the fact that God took charge of the body himself. He was the sexton who officiated at his interment and certified to his death accordingly. There was something strange about it. Whether Satan thought that he ought to have the body as being the body of a criminal, as was the goat that was given to Azazel, we do not know. But it is certain that Satan made an attempt to get it and Michael opposed it. God buried him, and no man knoweth his sepulcher to this day. To our own minds it would not be strange if some day or other God may not allow men to find the body of Moses. These are wonderful times for the exhuming of buried evidences according to the declaration, "found after many days."

The minister is dead, "Long live the minister." Jehovah the king now appoints Joshua to be his generalissimo, and puts him at the head of his army. He issued his instructions and his assurances to the new commander and bade him "Arise and take the people over Jordan." The royal insignia was to be continued unchanged. Taking precedence of everything else in the procession was that awe-inspiring Ark of the Covenant. That ark was the throne room of Jehovah, between the out-stretched wings of the golden cherubim of which, in blinding splendor, blazed the Shekinah, the symbol of his immediate presence.

They came to the Jordan; the bearers of the throne went down into the water. The moment their feet touched the current, the affrighted waters fled. "What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest, thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back?" A highway was made for them and they went over dry-shod. What a king of tremendous power Jehovah was! The earth trembled at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the God of Jacob. If he could do such things as those, what could he not do?

And now that they were in their own land the king showed them what kind of a people he must have to serve him. A new kingdom must be occupied by a new kind of people. He commanded Joshua to take sharp knives and to circumcise the people; but true circumcision is of the heart, and means regeneration. The people that served the king must be a regenerate people.

Now came Jericho. It is to be seen what Jehovah can do here. Jericho was a great city, a city of lofty, resisting walls, nor could those gates, braced with iron as they were, be rushed by any Israelitish host that could be hurled against them. But there was no need of anything of the kind. Jericho was to fall without hands, without battering rams and catapults. Yet the whole host must be mustered. A vast column of forty thousand now formed into a line preparatory to a march around the city. Some went ahead and some followed after. The most conspicuous thing in the whole procession was that Ark of the Covenant. There lay the hiding of the nation's power. Around the city they went. They repeated the performance the second day and on the third day and on the fourth day and on the fifth day and on the sixth day. The wonderful thing about it was the absolute stillness that attended their movements. There was no noise and no talking in the ranks; as in the silence of death they made their daily rounds and then went into camp. To the denizens of Jericho there must have been something surpassingly absurd in all this. On the seventh day they went around seven times. When the seventh round was completed there went up a single shout from that tremendous host: "Shout, for the Lord hath given you the city." And Jericho's walls came tumbling down on the run before the beleaguering hosts. Israel thus saw what Jehovah could do. Next Jehovah appears as a strategist at the taking of Ai. Then he appears as a criminal judge, in the case of Achan. He appears as a law-maker. He appears as an executive. More than all he appears now

as a divider up of the land and the giver of land titles to the various tribes of Israel. The book of Joshua, therefore, is a history of the conquest of the land and is also typical as a history of the conquest of this world by the forces of the church in the coming ages.

The book of Judges has a historic and pedagogic purpose of its own. The key to it is the oft-repeated sentence, "for there was no king in Israel, and every man did what was right in his own eyes." That means there was no human king. God was their king who reigned through a premier, but the people were willful and disobedient and prone to rebellion. They chafed under his righteous administration. God allowed them to have their own way and permitted them, as he so often does in his method of pedagogy, to do as they pleased for a time. It seems to have been a part of the purpose of Jehovah to allow samples of all sorts of government and also all samples of no sort of government, as was the case now.

Accordingly, we have an utter and wholly irresponsible kind of democracy, the most perilous that can be found. In fact it was an approximate anarchy, an anticipation of modern nihilism, and a lesson of warning on that account. Every man was his own king, autocratic and reckless and caring very little about his neighbor. Robbery, pillage, and violence as a consequence filled the land. The very high ways were deserted. The disregard of God's law which produced that state of things will produce it again, whenever it gains ascendancy, as it did in the days of the Judges. Nowadays men are divided on the question of "the source of authority." We have had up the question of the source of authority in the state, and men have been divided over it; some contending that kings rule by divine right, and others that the source of all political authority is the consent of the governed, a principle which is not to be applied too rigidly, for that would dethrone Christ. If the question of the kingship of Christ were put to people to-day, it is doubtful whether men,

even in this land of our own, would give him the majority, yet Christ intends to reign all the same, whether here or there. To him every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess.

In those days of the Judges the source of authority in the state and the source of authority in religion were up at the same time and were truthfully a part of one and the same question. With them at the start Jehovah was their king and the source of both kinds of authority. But they had backslidden from Jehovah, and as a consequence respect for all authority, religious as well as political, waned among them. The whole state of things culminated in one of the most revolting and blood-curdling iniquities that ever disgraced human history. It is told at the close of the book in the story of the Levite and his concubine.

But it is not the evil doings of the people that we are now looking at, but at the character of the king as he appeared in his administration; Jehovah was dethroned in heart long before he was in name. The way was being slowly prepared so far as it was in their power to bring it about; Jehovah was to be retired and Saul was to be exalted. But God was gracious to them and wonderfully generous and forgiving. To punish them he brought down upon them the heathen, but did not outright destroy them. When afterwards they were crushed under a heathen yoke and lifted up their prayer, in anguish crying unto their neglected king, then he raised up a deliverer and started them off again. That these proceedings in the times of the Judges have a modern application is evident from examples which can be given. The pieces of the dismembered body of the concubine sent round among the tribes shocked them awfully. The bloody appeal they dared not ignore, so they got together a vast host of them to consider. The first move was a demand on the tribe of Benjamin to deliver up to national justice the sons of Belial, who had been guilty of the dreadful crime. But Benjamin revolted and refused outright.

They intended to maintain their refusal by a battle against all Israel if need be. Israel made ready an army. Before they went up to fight they inquired of God if they should go up against Benjamin their brother? Jehovah said, "Yes, go up." But they were driven back with a frightful loss. Again they asked the Lord, "Shall we go up against our brother?" Again the answer of Jehovah was, "Yes, go up." And again they were beaten. Once more they asked counsel of God. Again God told them to go up, and the third time they nearly wiped Benjamin out.

Why was it that since Benjamin had committed so great a wrong they were allowed to inflict upon Israel two such heavy defeats, one of twenty-two thousand and one of eighteen thousand? The explanation is here. Benjamin was not alone guilty of the awful degeneracy which led to that horrible crime. The whole nation was guilty, therefore the whole nation was to be punished. Jehovah's plan was first of all to use Benjamin to scourge Israel, and then to use Israel to scourge Benjamin to the verge of destruction.

A parallel to this was found in the recent Civil War of our country. People of the North maintained that they were right, that slavery was an abomination in the sight of God, and therefore God would bless the Northern army from the start; but the fact is that slavery was not simply a Southern sin; it was a national sin. We all were guilty of it together. We had profited by slavery; therefore, when the time came God executed judgment at Bull Run, using the South to scourge the North, but before the war was over he used the North to vanquish the South.

The Book of the Kingdom Literature contains I, II, Samuel, I, II, Kings, I, II, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. The period covered by these books is about seven hundred and twenty-five years. They contain the history of the king and his subjects during that time.

The history of the people is a varied one. When it commenced Jehovah was still their king. Some time

afterwards, however, they became discontented and clamored for a human king to head the nation. This involved the supersedure of Jehovah. Nevertheless, by the order of Jehovah it was granted. Then followed a marvelous succession of kings of one kind and another—some good, some bad, and some indifferent. Saul led off, a self-willed, self-opinionated, intractable monarch who was repudiated by Jehovah before he had been two years on the throne, though he was allowed to reign the full forty years. After the two years David became God's appointee, and after him again Solomon. For many long years David, the duly appointed successor, was a fugitive and a wanderer. After Saul and David and Solomon, each of whom was a representative of a typical king, and after the kingdom was rent in twain, there followed a long succession of monarchs, but none of whom seemed to be particularly articulated in the typical genealogy. The books, however, which describe them come to us with God's imprimatur as genuine history. Though men were largely responsible for the make-up, God was responsible for the final overruling. They abound in material for character study. They involve also many illustrations of the interworking or co-ordinating of human freedom and divine sovereignty. In the affairs of ordinary life with us nowadays everything moves along seemingly a purely human substratum, but in the book of the kingdom history we see both the divine and the human working together like two wheels in a cog system, and from them we learn to discern providential overruling as well as human agency.

Human judicature in every nation is guided, in its decision, partly by enactments and partly by precedents, the latter being presumably based on the former, and are often more determined. A Book of Divine Revelation, of Divine Laws and Commandments, would be incomplete without an attendant exhibit of precedents illustrating and confirming. The value of these Old Testament books

for that purpose cannot be over-estimated. One will be surprised to find how many of the moral, social, and religious problems of our day have light thrown upon them by a comparison with similar examples in the Old Testament. With that we leave the subject in that form, and turn our thoughts to the contemplation of the king himself, as he appears in the administration of his kingdom and his people.

And first of all we are now to see Jehovah the king exercising a universal prerogative of royalty when it removes cabinet ministers and whole cabinets with them. In this case it was old Eli that was removed and the child Samuel was inducted into his place. A very old man and a very young child are the human parties in this strange affair. It was not simply old Eli that was now condemned, but it was the whole Aaronic priesthood in him. When a king enters into a treaty with another power, two agents are employed. The first is called a minister plenipotentiary, the second is a minister resident. The first has a specific commission and has no lineal successor, but the second has a continual succession. So when God made a treaty with Israel, Moses was his plenipotentiary. After the treaty was made, then Aaron and his sons after him were the administrators of it. But in the course of hundreds of years that elapsed the whole priestly administration had become corrupt and degenerate. Eli's sons were vile beyond description. Their end had come, and with them the end of an official recognition of the Aaronic priesthood.

But is it not true that the Aaronic priesthood continued in power? Yes, but when Eli was rejected the inadequacy of the whole of them was declared. It will be noticed how little God himself seemed to have to do with them from that time on. And as if to confirm all this, it will be noted how little Christ had to do with the high priests when he was upon earth. Communication had been broken off in the days of Eli and no man had ever been found to

take his place. The next priest whom God recognized after Eli was Christ himself.

The change was now to take place from the priestly to the prophetic. What Israel now needed was a line of prophets. Samuel being a very little boy was taken to signify the inauguration of the new prophetic line, to be continued until Christ should come.

An appalling disaster now happened to Israel. As intimated above, religious work had become grossly secularized under the elders of Israel. The Ark of God, instead of being the symbol of holy worship, became like a fetish or something to conjure by. There came a war between Israel and Philistia. Heavy forces were out on both sides. There were collisions and conflicts, but no conclusive results. The elders said, "We will bring out the ark of God to turn the scale." Such a thing was unprecedented. When the ark reached the camp the elation of the people was unbounded. A shout went up which was heard across the plain like the roar of the tempest, and the heavens rang again. The people thought that now certainly Jehovah would have to fight for his own, if he could not be made to fight for them in any other way. Surely Jehovah would not allow his very throne to be captured by an enemy, it would be too much of a disgrace; and so every man of them was braced up for a fight and confident victory.

Over in the camp of the Philistines excitement and alarm reigned supreme. They asked, "What meaneth all this shout from the Hebrew camp?" They were told that they had brought the ark of God into the camp. These lords of the Philistines knew all about Jehovah, though none of them worshiped him. It is a fashion in the East not to worship the gods of other nations. They knew Jehovah to be a mighty and a terrible God. They said one to another, "These are those mighty gods that smote the Egyptians. Now then we shall have to fight not only men, but gods. So brace up, ye Philistines, and fight for

your liberties and your lives." They rushed into the battle with the fury of desperation. To their surprise they won from the start. The Israelites fell in multitudes, the slaughter was prodigious. Thirty thousand of them were stretched out upon the plains and the two sons of Eli were slain.

The ark itself, the throne room of Jehovah, became a captive and a fugitive.

Old Eli, sitting in his seat at Shiloh, was anxiously awaiting tidings. All at once a fugitive from the battlefield came tearing into the camp. His garments were rent and he had dust upon his head. That meant disaster beyond question. Immediately the whole camp was in a tumult. Old Eli heard the uproar and sat trembling. The messenger went into detail before him. The army was hopelessly beaten. The dead were scattered all over the plain. The ditches ran with their blood. Eli trembled, but still listened.

The messenger continued. The two guardians of the Ark, Hophni and Phinehas, are dead. Eli continued to tremble, but still listened. The messenger went on with this terrible sentence, "AND THE ARK OF GOD IS TAKEN." As these words fell from his lips, old Eli, as if brained by a bludgeon, dropped from his seat and was dead. He was a very old man, ninety-eight years old, and a man of heavy physique.

The Aaronic line was now ended. Then was fulfilled the words of God, in which he said that the iniquity of Eli's house should not be purged with sacrifices and offerings forever. That meant that the growing degeneracy of three hundred and eighty-nine years had culminated and rejection was now reached.

But is it not true that there were to be high priests down to the time of Christ? Yes, but they were not God's appointees, as was Aaron and his house down to Eli, who was also of their line. So far as God's appointments were concerned, there was now to be a long hiatus in the

priesthood. For no less than eleven hundred and forty-one years God appointed no one to be priest, but there was to come some day a priest after God's own heart. As he said, "I will raise me up a faithful priest that will do according to all that is in my heart and my mind, and I will build him a storehouse and he shall walk before mine anointed forever." That priest was Christ. The intervening priests from Eli to Christ were not to be officially recognized. In confirmation of this view it will be noticed, as we have already said, that Christ when on earth never recognized a high priest. On the contrary, he refused to be interrogated by them.

The Philistines were exultant. It was the day of their lives. They had captured Generals and captured Princes, but this time they had captured a God, for they had his throne in their possession. There stood the ark, in all probability bespattered with the blood of its defenders. Uncircumcised hands took hold of its handles and carried it off, no doubt with many a jeer and jest. The mysterious chest, from which fiery lightnings were reputed to have darted forth, was now silent. It did nothing and said nothing, and was seemingly unable to help itself. All the more the merriment of the Philistines, as they lugged the hapless Ark back to their capital city. As the ancient manner was, they presented it as a trophy in his temple to their fish-god, Dagon. And there they left it. The next morning, lo and behold, Dagon was flat on his face. Had the Ark begun to assert itself? They seemed to have been scared only a little. It might have been an accident, for even their gods meet with mishaps. During the day they put Dagon on his feet and started him off all right again. The next morning he was down worse than ever. His hands and feet were cut off, and the only available part of him was a wooden stump. Could there be power in that ark after all to do these things? But there the ark stood, just where they put it, motionless and voiceless.

Next something like what we call nowadays bubonic

plague broke out among them, and they died off like sheep. But all the time the chest did nothing and manifested nothing. They concluded, however, that after all that chest was the danger spot. So they hurried it off to another one of their great cities, called Gath, but the plague was there as soon as they were, and the Gath people began to die off as rapidly as the others had done. Then they moved it off to Ekron, but the Ekron people began to protest; they did not want the ark there. The consternation was great among them. The bewildered heads of the Philistines resolved to send it back. They treated it at last with great distinction. They built a new cart especially to carry it back, drawn by new oxen that never before had been under the yoke; and they sent along presents of gold, and imitation emerods of gold by the way of an apology to the God of Israel. They followed it at a safe distance. The oxen, guided by an unseen power, made straight for the border. The lords of the Philistines breathed freely and came back home. This was the first campaign of Jehovah among the heathen, lasting seven months and a half. The Philistines had captured it with glee. Their sense of relief was great when they got rid of it.

And now occurred an appalling and wicked incident in their national history. Influenced by the heathen nations around them, they had been gradually working toward the notion of a man-king, whereas God was their king. Samuel was indignant and shocked at their disloyalty. He remonstrated with them. He thought perhaps that it was because of dissatisfaction, possibly with himself, and still more with his sons, who were not proving themselves to be worthy judges of Israel. But God told him to accede to their wishes, for it is not you they reject, but me, said Jehovah. God selected a man for them; that man was Saul, the son of Kish. Saul was a great burly fellow, possessed of much physical stateliness, was a resolute, impulsive leader, with much daring and also

much rashness in his composition. The latter soon brought him to his ruin. Samuel was sent to anoint him. It was a simple ceremony, but the essentials were all observed. Thenceforth Jehovah was to be relegated to a subordinate dignity.

This did not mean, however, that Jehovah intended to allow the reins of power to drop from his hands. He did not allow it then, and he has not done it since, and he never will do it. However, if he did not reign over these rebellious subjects as king, he would persist in reigning over them as God. The fathers rejected Jehovah as king. Not Jehovah, but a man-king; in the same manner, at a later day, the children said, "We will not have this man 'to reign over us,' not Jesus, but Barrabas." In turn both Jehovah and Jesus have been rejected as king over men.

The divinely appointed and articulated kingships of Israel were five in number :

Jehovah	Reigned	389 years.
Saul	Reigned	40 years.
David	Reigned	40 years.
Solomon	Reigned	40 years.
Jesus the Anointed, whose reign is everlasting.		

The interim kings of Judah and Israel, of the lines of Rehoboam and Jeroboam are entered into the scripture records by divine appointment, and were under divine supervision. They were not, however, of the articulated line. It has been already stated that the priestly line ended with Eli, the others had no divine appointment, but existed by sufferance. The next priest of God's appointment was Christ himself. In like manner the next divinely appointed king after Solomon was Jesus himself.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.*

BY REV. DAWSON WALKER, D. D., DURHAM, ENGLAND.

It is possible to view the character of St. Paul from many widely differing standpoints. To some, he is the inspired apostle, the Divinely commissioned messenger to the Gentile world. To others, he is a remarkable Jew who elaborated certain peculiar views of his own about the person and the work of Christ Jesus,—views which he impressed with such vigor on his fellow believers that they have dominated the thought of Christendom till the present day. There is one point, however, on which all students of his life and epistles must heartily agree. They must admit that rarely in the history of the human race have so many varied gifts been bestowed on any one individual as those with which the personality of St. Paul was enriched.

The portions of his correspondence that remain to us are the best witness to his complex and many sided character. He is, on the one hand, the theologian, the mystic, the preacher, the student of Old Testament Scripture. Of these powers *Romans*, *Colossians*, *Ephesians* and *Philippians* are the abiding monument. On the other hand, he is the organizer, the administrator, the man of affairs in the fullest sense of that term. For the most ample proof of this we need look no further than the two Epistles to the Corinthians.

These two are, in a sense, more “occasional” than any of the extant epistles. They are concerned with the men, the problems, the errors and the vices of the Corinthian community at that time. St. Paul is distracted between

* Three articles will follow this from the pen of Dr. Walker in successive issues of THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR. Two articles will deal with the contents of First Corinthians and one with the contents of Second Corinthians.—Editor.

affection for his converts, grief at their faults and wrath at the Jewish emissaries who are splitting the church into factions and alienating its members from himself. In no other epistles have we such rapid changes in the writer's mood. Tender affection, stern denunciation, contemptuous sarcasm, passionate vindication of himself and his work—follow one another in quick succession. And yet in the midst of all this we have wise counsel on detailed points of practice—on the proper conduct of married life, on the duties of parents, on the right standard of conduct for the Christian in general society. We have, too, the series of injunctions about the Holy Communion and the elaborate discussion of the nature and use of spiritual gifts. We have his lyrical outburst—the matchless passage on Love, and we have that first great doctrinal essay—the chapter on the Resurrection.

The second epistle contains a piece of unique autobiography, the vivid sketch of the toils and persecutions amidst which his life was spent—followed later by the account of his heavenly visions, and of the personal affliction, sent to him, he believed, lest he should be “exalted overmuch.” Between these passages is inserted the lengthy and business-like account of the arrangements for the contributions for the Christian poor at Jerusalem.

Even so slight a survey as this gives some idea of the wealth and variety of matter contained in these two epistles. It is the aim of the following articles to survey their contents with somewhat greater fulness; to realize the situation in the church which called them forth; to appreciate the statesmanship and skill with which the apostle performed his task of government; to recall the permanent elements in his teaching and the message that they still bear for us.

Before, however, proceeding to a survey of the contents of these epistles, there are certain points connected with their history that need to be discussed. With re-

gard to the First, the need is very slight. No Pauline epistle has a stronger consensus of external and internal evidence to its genuineness; nor is there any question amongst reasonable critics as to its unity. But the case is very different with the Second. That it is Pauline and that it was written to Corinth no man, with a reputation for criticism to lose, would express any doubt. About its *unity* there is no such chance of agreement. In fact, there are few questions of New Testament criticism on which men, who are for the most part in agreement, find themselves so divided. The unity of 2 Corinthians is one of those questions, like the South Galatian theory and the authorship of 2 Peter, which seem to divide reasonable and reverent critics into two opposing camps.

The unity of the epistle, however, is by no means the only difficulty. In the course of it St. Paul speaks of earlier visits paid, and of earlier letters written to Corinth. The arrangement of these in chronological sequence, and the adjustment of them to other known events of St. Paul's career, seems to be a problem that is incapable of solution. In this respect the transition from 1 Corinthians to 2 Corinthians has been well compared to the passage from the clear paths of a laid-out park into the obscurity of a trackless forest. There have been, indeed, many intrepid explorers, and in most cases, each has struck out his own peculiar path. It has been a conspicuous case of *quot homines tot sententiae*.

It will serve to simplify our discussion of the unity of the 2nd Epistle, if we sketch quite briefly the previous history. To mention and discuss earlier contending theories as to the previous letters and visits would require much more space than can here be allowed. It must suffice therefore to indicate what seems on the whole to have been the most probable order of events. The ground will then be cleared for a discussion of the question whether or not we have within the limits of 2 Corinthians parts of two or more Pauline epistles.

St. Paul's first recorded visit to Corinth may probably be assigned to the year 52 A. D. Soon after his arrival in the city he made the acquaintance of Aquila and Prisca, who, along with the rest of the Jewish colony in Rome, had recently been expelled by an Imperial edict. There is a great deal of probability in the suggestion that the apostle's eager wish to see Rome and to preach the gospel there originated at this time from his conversations with these two friends. They, at any rate, were fresh from Rome and would have much to tell him of the local conditions. After the arrival of messengers with good news of the Macedonian churches, St. Paul was encouraged to preach the gospel with such uncompromising zeal that a breach with Judaism and the Synagogue took place. From the furious hostility of his countrymen the apostle was rescued by the judicial firmness and clear-sighted tolerance of Gallio. The stirring experiences of this visit occupied a space of eighteen months. When at the end of this time St. Paul departed for Syria, a Christian community in Corinth was an established fact.

Not long after his departure the Alexandrian Jew Apollos, whose knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures made him such a powerful advocate for Christ, was urged by his friends to visit Corinth. His vindication of Christianity was zealous and effective, but—possibly owing to the disordered condition of the church at Corinth—he seems to have taken an early opportunity of rejoining St. Paul at Ephesus. It must have been somewhere about this time that the apostle wrote to the Corinthian church the epistle to which he alludes in 1 Corinthians 5:9—a letter which is unfortunately lost. This lost epistle, however, was by no means his only point of contact with his Corinthian converts. They “of the household of Chloe” brought news to St. Paul. These people were not improbably representatives of a commercial house trading between Corinth and Ephesus. Their news was chiefly of faction and of party spirit carried to the wildest excess.

The information they brought was soon supplemented by a letter from the Corinthians, asking for the apostle's counsel on various points and incidentally giving him a further insight into their own disordered state.

The situation in Corinth was so grave that action of some kind was necessary. The claims of the work at Ephesus were so pressing that St. Paul could not go to Corinth in person. But he sent a messenger and he wrote a letter. The messenger was Timothy and the letter was our First Epistle to the Corinthians.

The probability is that Timothy did not reach Corinth. A comparison of St. Luke's words in Acts 19:22 with those of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 4:17, 16:10, makes it almost certain that he did not go beyond Macedonia. In the epistle that he sent, St. Paul deals with the whole situation that had been revealed, partly by the letter from Corinth, partly by the tidings brought by the messengers of Chloe.

It is at this point that the narrative of events that has hitherto been clear and indisputable, passes into the darkest obscurity. When the track appears to be so hopelessly lost, it is hardly to be wondered that each explorer prefers his own route to that suggested by any other. With the clear proviso, then, that the region through which we are passing is highly debatable, we may proceed to arrange the events in the following order:

There are passages in 2 Corinthians which justify the assumption that I Corinthians was conveyed to Corinth by Titus and a "brother" who remains un-named. The same passages indicate that on this occasion Titus began to organize the collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem. It would appear that he then returned to St. Paul at Ephesus.

In the meantime opposition to the apostle was increasing at Corinth. The view is probably correct that regards the "Christ party" as a band of Jewish emissaries,

holding some sort of credentials from the church at Jerusalem, and animated by a bitter hostility to St. Paul and his work. So successful were their attacks upon him that he hastened in person to Corinth. The visit seems to have been brief, unsuccessful and humiliating.

St. Paul, however, would not give up the battle. He would not, without another effort, allow the church, on which he had spent so much toil, to be torn from his grasp. Titus was despatched to Corinth with another epistle—an epistle, this time, couched in severe and uncompromising terms. The epistle was so severe that, when it had once left his hands, the apostle was distracted by anxiety as to its possible effects. Would it win the Corinthians back to their allegiance—or would it be the last stroke that would finally sever them from him?

Under these circumstances, further work at Ephesus was impossible for him. His one desire was to meet Titus and hear the result of the epistle. Thinking to meet Titus on his return journey the distracted apostle went so far as Troas. There were opportunities here for evangelistic work—but he had not the heart to seize them. He wandered on into Macedonia still possessed by the one idea—of meeting Titus and learning the worst.

Here it was that the strain ended and the sorely tried heart found relief. In Macedonia Titus found him and cheered him with the joyful news that all had turned out for the best. The Corinthians had received the epistle with submission, had returned to their allegiance, were prepared to go any lengths to prove their loyalty. In the joy of his heart at this renewal of their former friendship St. Paul wrote to them an epistle—an epistle which either is, or is contained in, our Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

This somewhat hesitating phrase introduces us to the problem of the unity of that epistle. Is the epistle which St. Paul sent on this occasion co-extensive with our 2 Corinthians, or is the epistle that we know by name made

up partly of this epistle and partly of fragments of earlier epistles? The question may be defined a little more exactly by saying that there is a powerful body of first-class critical opinion which holds that the first nine chapters of our 2 Corinthians represent the epistle written on this occasion, while chapters 10-13 are a part of that earlier severe epistle about the results of which the apostle was so keenly anxious.

Before attempting to discuss this question on its merits a word may be said as to the origin and growth of it. Semler of Halle seems to have been the first critic to suggest that the epistle is composed of fragments. He was led to this by the marked contrast between chapters 1-9 on the one hand and chapters 10-13 on the other, and apparently he did not seek for further proofs. His suggestion met with little favor in Germany and was ignored elsewhere. In process of time, however, the theory he had advocated gained greater support till in 1870 there appeared a pamphlet on the *Vier-Capitel-Brief*, by Hausrath, of Heidelberg, in which the division of the epistle into two parts at the end of chapter 9 was again advocated. The suggestion was examined and dismissed by Klöpffer in 1874. By many, Klöpffer's refutation had been regarded as final and complete, but the discussion entered on a new stage by the publication, in 1897, of some articles in the *Expositor* by Dr. J. H. Kennedy, followed in 1900 by his book on *The Second and Third Epistles to the Corinthians*. There is one important difference, however, to be noted between Hausrath's theory and that of Kennedy. The former held that chapters 10-13 form the *whole* of the severe epistle written by St. Paul; the latter prefers the view that what we possess is two mutilated fragments; that chapters 10-13 are the concluding part of the earlier severe epistle of which the opening part has been lost, while chapters 1-9 are the earlier part of the epistle written on the return of Titus, and that here the concluding part has been lost.

In other words, by design or accident, the *end* of the earlier severe epistle has been attached to the *beginning* of the later cordial one; hence the marked difference in tone between the two parts of the epistle as we have it.

There seems on the whole to be an increasing tendency to accept this view. Some of those who finally reject it only do so after a careful discussion of its claims. Dr. Robertson's verdict in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* is, that "on the whole as regards internal evidence, we may say that the case for separation is not proved, but it would be going too far to say that it is absolutely disproved." Dr. Sanday in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* decides against the separation. Among the scholars who accept Kennedy's view may be named Adeney, Bacon, König, McGiffert, Plummer and Schmiedel.

We come now to a brief examination of the question itself. And in doing this, it is necessary in the case of one particular point, not merely to note it, but to write it large in the forefront of the whole discussion. This important point is the fact that the whole case for separation rests entirely on *internal evidence*. There is not a fragment of external evidence to be adduced in its favor; on the contrary it is wholly against any such dissection of the epistle. There is no evidence that any scribe, translator or patristic writer ever knew the epistle in any other form than that in which we have it. In other words, we have no evidence from manuscript, version or patristic text that either of these alleged fragments ever had a separate existence.

What then is the internal evidence that calls for this drastic step? Is it sufficient in itself to counterbalance this entire absence of external testimony?

It will probably be more helpful for the clear understanding of the problem if the arguments for separation be stated without comment, all criticism and counter suggestion being reserved for the end.

(1) The first point is that the apostle himself de-

scribes this earlier epistle as being written "out of much affliction and anguish of heart . . . with many tears." (2 Cor. 2:4). Such a description as this would seem exaggerated if applied to our 1 Corinthians. But the whole of chapters 10-13 may well have been written in much anguish and distress of mind. The severity is unquestionable; and it must have cost the writer many a pang to speak in this strain to those whom he loved and was anxious to win back to himself.

(2) It seems almost inconceivable that St. Paul could have written such words as chapters 10-13 contain, just at this time. We have noted the intense anxiety with which he awaited the return of Titus. He himself expresses the unfeigned joy which the news of Titus brought to him. In chapters 1-9 he expresses this joy with the utmost tenderness and kindness towards his Corinthian friends. Confident in this renewed cordiality he proceeds with all delicacy and courtesy to press on them in chapters 8 and 9 the question of contribution for the poor saints at Jerusalem, and then—there is a leap into a torrent of stinging sarcasm and biting reproof. View it as we will, there is undoubtedly a very real gap. Chapters 1-9 are entirely appropriate to St. Paul's feelings when Titus returned. How chapters 10-13 could harmonize with the joyous thankfulness of his mood seems very difficult to say.

(3) There are certain passages, which, if the epistle is to be regarded as an indivisible whole, appear to be mutually contradictory. It will suffice to quote one or two as typical of a larger number. In 7:4 he says: "Great is my glorying on your behalf." In 7:16 he says: "I rejoice that in everything I am of good courage concerning you." In 8:7 he says: "Ye abound in faith and utterance and knowledge." But in 12:20, 21 he says: "I fear . . . lest by any means there should be strife, jealousy, wraths, factions, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults; lest . . . I should mourn for many

of them that have sinned heretofore, and repented not of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they committed." It seems almost inexplicable that in the course of *one* epistle, that passage of dark suspicion should follow immediately on these utterances of confidence and love. If, however, that severe passage really belongs to an earlier epistle when the relations between the apostle and his converts were strained, and the other passages belong to the later epistle when that unhappy time was over and the apostle could congratulate them on their better mood—then all is clear.

(4) We come now to a proof, which Kennedy regards as the sheet anchor of his theory. It is concerned with certain particular passages. There are expressions occurring in chapters 1-9 which *seem* to verbally refer to passages in chapters 10-13. The expressions in chapters 10-13 are in the present tense; those in chapters 1-9 are in the past tense. Standing in their present order in the epistle they seem inexplicable. But on the assumption that chapters 10-13 constitute the whole or part of the earlier severe epistle, then these backward references in the later epistle, i. e., our chapters 1-9, become perfectly clear. The force of this argument will be more easily seen if the passages in question be placed side by side:

10:6—Being in readiness to avenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be fulfilled.

2:9—To this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you whether you are obedient in all things.

13:2—If I come again, I will not spare.

1:23—To spare you I forbore to come to Corinth.

13:10—I write these things while absent, that I may not when present deal sharply.

2:3—I wrote this very thing, lest, when I came, I should have sorrow.

(5) One more line of proof may be mentioned. It is a matter of detail, but to the present writer it appears more convincing than some of the arguments hitherto adduced. The earlier severe epistle would almost certainly have been written from Ephesus. It is equally certain that the letter despatched on the arrival of Titus was written some-

where in Macedonia. Bearing these facts in mind, we note that in 10:16 the apostle speaks of his hope "to preach the gospel even unto the parts beyond you." The obvious reference of this is to Italy and Spain. Now, on the assumption that these words form part of the earlier severe epistle written from Ephesus, they are accurate and exact. Italy does lie beyond Corinth in a straight line to one writing from Ephesus. The words do not seem to be so properly used in an epistle written from Macedonia. Italy does not lie beyond Corinth to a man writing in Macedonia.

Here, then, we have the case for separation. The foregoing summary of the evidence, though brief, may claim to be fair. It remains now, to strike a balance, if possible, between these contending probabilities and improbabilities. Are all these arguments, based on the *internal* evidence, sufficient to outweigh the total absence of external evidence, or rather, one may say, the extreme improbability from the side of the *external* evidence that the epistle should be so split up?

"Extreme improbability" is not too strong a phrase; it is capable of being justified. It should be noted, in the first place that the joining of these two fragments—if it took place at all—must have done so quite early. It must have been before the time of Irenæus, because he quotes the passage 2 Cor. 12: 7-9 and refers to it (the words are extant in the Latin version) as coming "in *secunda quae est ad Corinthios*." Kennedy suggests a date about the year 96 A. D. when Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito were despatched from Rome to Corinth to report on the effect of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians. The main point, however, is that it must have taken place during the "papyrus" period when books were still circulated in the roll form and not in the "codex" form. It is not uncommon to find certain business or official documents united into one roll; and there would be nothing extraordinary in one or more short epistles being joined to-

gether in the same roll. But there is by no means the same probability that a *fragment* of an epistle should be attached to a fragment of another epistle. The hypothesis is that the beginning of this second fragment (i. e., the earlier epistle) is lost. Now this brings us to a crucial question. Was the joining of these two fragments intentional or unintentional? If it was intentional, why was the opening part of the second fragment omitted? If it was done unintentionally, purely as the result of accident, then the chances are a thousand to one against the first fragment ending with a complete sentence and the second one beginning at the beginning of a sentence. The probabilities are much greater that rough edges would in some way be visible at the point of juncture.

Then again, on the hypothesis of *accident* we must suppose that this one copy, in which fragments of two separate epistles have been joined by accident, was the only one to survive, and that every trace of the two component epistles in their separate form has perished. In fact the suggestion that fragments of two epistles have been joined in this casual, unintentional way, in such fashion as to rouse no mention of it in the earliest writers is a literary phenomenon so remarkable as to be incredible.

If, on the other hand, we are to suppose that the joining of the two fragments was done of set purpose—by members of the Corinthian church, or by some other person—one can only reply that it seems incredible that any one should have deliberately taken two fragments so widely different in tone and temper, and should have welded them into one epistle; and, what is more remarkable, should have disturbed the proper sequence, putting the earlier severe document out of its proper place, *after* the later more cordial one.

External documentary evidence, then, is not merely silent. Its silence is loudly eloquent against the separation. This, however, does not end the whole debate, for

we are still left face to face with the admitted gap between chapter 9 and chapter 10. Why does St. Paul, after nine chapters of cordiality and forgiveness, pass at a stroke into a passage of severe rebuke and invective? There are one or two considerations that seem to the present writer to go a long way—if not the whole distance—towards explaining this.

In the first place, no one of these longer Pauline epistles was composed at one sitting. Such epistles as *Romans* and *1 Corinthians* must have cost the apostle and his amanuensis many a sitting of laborious work. Now there is nothing unreasonable in supposing that when St. Paul had reached the end of chapter 9, further news arrived from Corinth of disaffection in the church, due to the machinations of his Judaizing foes “the Christ party.” It has been objected to this view that there is no hint of the arrival of any additional news of this kind, while, on the other hand, there is constant mention of the good news brought by Titus. Have we not, however, a real parallel in the epistle to the Philippians? In 3:1 of that epistle the apostle is evidently just drawing to a close. Then, all at once, without a word of preliminary warning he plunges into an anti-Judaizing invective: “Beware of the dogs, beware of the evil workers, etc.” Evidently some news had come to hand at that moment of the intrigues of his Jewish enemies, which caused him to break off into his impassioned warning. May we not suppose that something similar happened in the case of the Corinthian epistle?

This hypothesis seems to be quite adequate to account for the phenomena. The severe earlier epistle, which the apostle wrote in anguish of heart, we must suppose to be lost, just like the still earlier epistle referred to in 1 Cor. 5:9. The stern reproof of chapters 10-13 follows on the kindness of chapters 1-9 because new circumstances had occurred to evoke it. This will account, too, for the more severe passages in the latter part which seem

to contradict the more kindly sentiments of the earlier part. With reference to the particular passages quoted, 2:3 and 13:10 refer, in the opinion of the present writer, to two different epistles, just as 1:23 and 13:2 refer to two different occasions. The connection between 2:9 and 10:6 is too slight to warrant any conclusion. In face of all this, the argument that, because Italy lies beyond Corinth in a straight line from Ephesus, therefore the passage 10:6 *must* have been written from Ephesus, is precarious. It is not impossible that the apostle writing from Macedonia to Corinth, may have spoken of Italy and Spain as "the parts beyond you."

In addition to the above considerations one or two further points may be quite briefly noticed. It is a fair inference from 2 Cor. 7:8, 2:4 that there was but *one* severe epistle; and it seems highly probable that it is referred to in 2 Cor. 10:10 f. If this be so, then obviously these chapters 10-13 cannot be identified with the epistle. It is clear, too, that when the apostle wrote the severe epistle, he wrote in order to avoid the necessity of paying a visit in person (1:23); but when he wrote these last chapters he was on the point of paying a visit (12:14, 13:1). Hence his intentions at the time of writing these chapters are quite different from what he says his intentions were when he wrote the painful epistle.

These points taken in connection with the considerations previously brought forward, lead us to the conclusion that the case for the *Vier-Capitel-Brief* has not been made out. External and internal evidence combine to maintain our conviction of the integrity of the epistle.

In the foregoing discussion we have confined ourselves to the question of the last four chapters. An almost stronger case might be made out for the view that the short paragraph 6:14—7:1 is an interpolated fragment from some earlier epistle of the apostle to Corinth. It certainly seems to break into the sense of the passage, and 7:2 joins quite smoothly on to 6:13 if the paragraph

be excised. Here, too, however, the objection from the side of the external evidence is almost insuperable. While, on the other hand, the passage has so much affinity with certain parts of the context, that its presence is by no means inexplicable.

Our conclusion, therefore, about the last four chapters may be extended to the epistle as a whole. In the absence of much more convincing evidence than is at present available we retain the conviction that what we now possess is the Second Epistle to the Corinthians in the form in which it left the hands of St. Paul.

THE PREACHER FOR THE PRESENT SOUTH.

BY PROF. S. C. MITCHELL, PH. D., RICHMOND COLLEGE.

Taking for granted that special adaptation to the place and people is one of the marks of a strong ministry, may we inquire whether anything in the Southern situation is distinctive. Examination will show that the work of the ministry is beset by difficulties that are peculiar and momentous. Without attempting even to enumerate them all, it may not be amiss to dwell for a while upon certain factors—the racial, industrial, political, educational and intellectual—which affect the conditions of the preacher's work in the present South.

I. THE RACIAL FACTOR.

Foremost stands the racial factor. The history of the South is surpassingly tragic. It includes single crises of great pith and moment. But these have been only bubbles from the surface, indicating the disturbed conditions in the depths of its life. Its sorrow has been chronic. The kind of heroism which Providence has demanded of it is not like that of a man who nerves himself once for the quick stroke of the surgeon's knife, but rather like the fortitude of a man smitten with some baffling and seemingly incurable disease, who exercises faith without hope, who continues to work without reward, and who knows sorrow without sympathy. Often has this sufferer heard the passer-by make the heartless inquiry: "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" I believe that if we are open-minded to learn from the Divine Interpreter of human history we shall to-day hear the answer: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." The grandest sociological experiment

in history is taking place in the South at this time. On its issues many of the largest facts in the future of humanity depend. Can two alien races dwell together upon the same soil in the spirit of mutual helpfulness? Or must two differing peoples be kept apart, like sheep and wolves, if animalism is not to work annihilation to the weaker folk?

This, let us note clearly, is a novel experiment. For millenniums the highly-cultured Europeans lived in isolation, like an oasis in the desert. Of late there has been a dispersion of these advanced peoples. They have come into vital contact with backward races in all quarters of the earth, whether islands or continents. Hence we now for the first time begin to divide the world into fourteen educating nations, such as England, France, America, Japan, Germany, set over against countless undeveloped races. It is a distinction similar to that in our statistics between the literate and illiterate in our own population. Many are the races of mankind that have not gone to school. Their capacities, therefore, are as yet undetermined. This statement has the more point if we remember that the racial curriculum is of necessity a long one. The South is placed at the bloody angle of this far-flung battle line of racial adjustment.

Here are ten million Africans, recently risen from savagery through slavery to civilization, separated socially from the Saxons by a great gulf fixed, but otherwise interlaced inextricably in all our life. The negro problem has, to be sure, its economic and political aspects, but it is primarily sociological or moral. And hence it comes largely within the domain of the preacher's duty. To insist upon justice, to beget the spirit of mutual helpfulness, to uphold the majesty of law, to allay prejudice, to strengthen faith in man and in the inherent capacity of the least developed among mankind, to broaden sympathy so as to embrace humanity, to make known the potency of love which never faileth, these are

the penetrative influences which the preacher of the present South can exert toward a solution of this stressful situation. He, and he almost alone, occupies the moral vantage ground from which a sane, just and total view of the complex forces in this strife is to be obtained. It is a critical juncture demanding, not the priest but the prophet, clear in vision, courageous in conviction, and so sympathetic that the burden of his message ever is, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people," in the unprecedented task set for them by heaven.

II. THE INDUSTRIAL FACTOR.

We are living in the midst of a revolution mightier far in its effects than that of France in 1789. The industrial revolution, which began in England toward the close of the eighteenth century, on the continent after the Napoleonic wars, and in the North about the same time, has of late begun to sweep through the South. The industrialization of the South is as desirable as it is inevitable. It is undeniably causing social changes of a radical sort. In a recent visit to the great Olympia Cotton Mill in Columbia, S. C., I was impressed anew with the number of social problems growing out of this economic transition. Here were hundreds of families, torn from the ancestral farm, grouped in an exclusive community, thrust into strange conditions as regards labor, housing, the rights of children, social ideals and religious needs.

We shall be compensated in part for the tardiness with which we have entered upon this era of industrialism, if we are careful to profit by the experience of others in meeting the difficulties incident to its introduction. Happily for us, England and other countries have by painful experience learned the lessons of child labor, compulsory education, sanitation, a living wage and a fair working-day. Instead of repeating their blunders, we must ad-

vance to a solution of some of the matters still unadjusted, such as the right use of the leisure which the working man has won and the welding of the sympathies of the classes and the masses. If our religion is the application of the eternal spirit of Christ to the changing conditions of mankind, then here is ample opportunity for the consecrated commonsense of the preacher to show itself in the highest forms of statesmanship.

III. THE POLITICAL FACTOR.

The race problem in the South would be sufficiently taxing if divested of all extraneous difficulties. But, as a matter of fact, it has been the misfortune of the South to have the racial situation aggravated by the passions of war and the prejudices of intense sectional politics. The chasm between the Saxon and the negro has been widened by party antagonisms. The South has remained solid, not so much against the North as against the negro. This party solidity has, I need not add, tended to repress spontaneity in thinking and independence in acting. The demagogue has too often found that an appeal to prejudice is an end of argument. Thus the finer sensibilities of our people are sometimes dulled, their vision beclouded and their nobler impulses intimidated.

Now, there are many things of which I am doubtful, but of this one fact I am absolutely sure—namely, that the supreme duty of the preacher for the present South is to let politics alone. Yet, as the interpreter of the moral forces of his day, he has the power to influence for good the complex activities of life. As Emerson says, the moral sentiment underlies all. It would be strange indeed if God's prophet had no message of special import for a people who had been defeated in a fearful war, who had endured the terrors of reconstruction, who had experienced political isolation, and who are at present striving heroically to develop the material resources of their

country, rebuild their institutions, relate themselves anew to the national life, and regain their prestige in Federal counsels. To inspire Southern men with confidence in their ability to do the tasks set them, to quicken the public conscience, to assert a right judgment upon all great issues, to evoke national patriotism, these are the lines of endeavor which at once suggest themselves to you. Sympathy is the cure for sectionalism as well as for sectarianism.

IV. THE EDUCATIONAL FACTOR.

In education the South presents an interesting study. Three distinct processes are going forward. First, the education of the poor whites, skulking in mountain recesses; second, the education of the negroes; and third, the democratizing of the educational ideals and methods of the former aristocratic or feudal class. While these three forces appear separate, they all really spring from the one generating impulse of democracy, which is just now becoming ascendant in the Southland. Some people are favorable to one of these educational purposes and hostile to another. In my humble opinion, they are all three necessary and must prevail.

The reasons for this conclusion need not be given here. Suffice it to say, that for economic development, racial adjustment and national integration we must rely upon the school, where the triple influences of thrift, intelligence and virtue meet. The school is the epitome of the South's problem. For the solution of our peculiar difficulties must come not by might nor by power, but by the spirit of love, justice, humanity and progress. Accordingly, the educational revival in the South has breathed a deep religious spirit, rich in human interest and sustained by a lofty faith in the efficacy of truth, freedom and righteousness to accomplish results impossible to ordinary material agencies. To say that the ministry has made a large contribution to the progress of education in the South, would be to understate the great services which

they have rendered to this cause. In their frank insistence upon the right of every child to a fair chance in life, in their incitement of community effort to secure this advantage in the school, and in the encouragement upon every hand which they have given to these constructive forces, the preachers of the South have written one of the noblest chapters in the history of Christian enterprise.

V. THE INTELLECTUAL FACTOR.

The advances in historical and scientific studies necessitate a reference to the preacher's attitude toward these questions, which have a direct, though general, bearing upon one's fitness for the Southern field. In such matters, a minister's attitude is largely determined by the comparative valuation which he makes of his various activities. What, according to Jesus, is a correct gradation of the relative worth of the preacher's manifold duties? There is, of course, much room for difference in answering this question, but may I suggest the following classification:

(1) The pursuit of truth.

(2) The exertion of personal influence. "I perceive that virtue hath gone forth from me." The preacher is to be conscience to a community.

(3) Deeds of mercy such as visitation of the sick, sorrowful and imprisoned.

(4) The organization of what we ordinarily mean by church work, partly financial, partly social, and partly ecclesiastic.

The ministry of truth, the ministry of personality, the ministry of mercy, and the ministry of work. And the greatest of these is the pursuit of truth. This denotes the sublimest energy of the human soul. "It is the glory of man that he cannot live by bread alone." Jesus charted the entire course of the Christian church when he said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you

free." And by truth he must have meant something vital, something potent in human experience, and not tradition. The truth of yesterday is the tradition of to-day. Of the manna, "they gathered every man according to his eating. And Moses said unto them, Let no man leave of it till morning. Notwithstanding, they hearkened not unto Moses; but some of them left of it till morning, and it bred worms, and became foul."

In this transitional time as regards evolutionary science and historical research, the preacher for the present South will hold by this sane maxim: "There is nothing so conservative as progress." How comes it that England is the only country in Europe that has not known a revolution within the past century? It is because the English, guided by sound political instinct, anticipated revolution by reform. The world appears to be fixity. In truth, it is fluidity. By an attitude of mind, open, hospitable sympathetic, conservative and, above all, sane, the preacher can mould in the wisest way the progressive thought of the South, relating it vitally to world-movements and keeping it true to the fundamental principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

In a word, the situation in the South, as I understand it, is a most attractive one for the preacher, because the work is such as to appeal to the strongest and noblest powers in his personality. Every true preacher is a prophet, a man who is the product of a crisis, who was born to meet an emergency, who discerns the divine reality in the present; whereas the priest is content merely to keep up the recollection of it in the past. In the South the preacher will be, as always, the forerunner of a higher social order, inspiring with courage the disheartened and directing the energies of our people to spiritual ends. In the subtle processes of Southern life you are to-day evolving a larger conception of humanity; for you are advancing from the superiority of the Saxon to the brotherhood of man; from sectionalism to nationalism; from na-

tionalism to a sense of international justice, which embraces the claims of the weak as well as the strong the world around. You are leading our people to see that perhaps their highest eulogium hereafter will be, when a folk once despised shall instinctively exclaim, "Thy gentleness hath made me great!"

THE THEORETICAL VALUE OF MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.*

II.

BY PROF. JAMES TEN BROEKE, TORONTO, CANADA.

Having been brought face to face with such real difficulties as those brought forward by this review of Bradley, we might take refuge in the conviction that it is left to the moral and religious side of our nature to lay hold of the Divine; that through the exercise of faith lived out, we arrive at a knowledge of the absolute, of ourselves and of the significance of the world that cannot be gained by theoretical reason. This is what is done, for example, by Albrecht Ritschl and his followers, namely, Herrmann, Kaftan and Harnack, not to mention others; they hold the view that the soul has a side of its nature which responds to the divine actions upon it and arrives at a trustworthy knowledge of the true unity of God, man and the world which is the ethical end of God in His Kingdom of ends, being realized in finite persons. Just as the soul actively responds to certain sense stimulations in sensations of light, and, rejecting Kant's separation between phenomena and noumena, knows the thing of nature, likewise the soul responds to certain operations of the divine spirit upon it in unique moral and religious acts and arrives at a sure knowledge of God and his nature. And in what will this unity of God, man, and the world consist? In an identity of ends; the end of the finite person, the end of the world-process, and the end of the personal God himself, are the same—all embraced in the ethical kingdom of God which is the conception of a society of moral selves. Thus

* The first division of Professor Ten Broeke's discussion appeared in the October, 1906, number of THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR.—Editors.

* Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, III, p 21-24.

reality is a whole. Thus it is that "Christianity alone fulfills the true demand for a unity between man and the world and God."* This principle of Christianity, distinguishing it from every philosophical attempt to apprehend the unity of all things, is the essential teaching of Christ, of Paul, of Augustine, of Luther, namely, that the soul has direct experience of God and in its faith awakens to a consciousness of its own destiny in the ethical kingdom of God and that this is the unity-giving principle between God, man and the world.

Ritschl has raised a great question, namely: May not the unity sought by our reason be found in the unity of ends, all embraced in the ethical kingdom of God, thus consummating the unity of man, world and God? May not this great truth become the conscious possession of the soul in its active faith in response to the divine operation upon it—a valid knowledge—a knowledge that cannot be gained in any other way?*** While I believe this solution of the world-problem is an improvement upon the agnostic position which regards the absolute as Unknowable Power and upon such a mediating position as that of Bradley which regards morality as ultimate but in a "transmuted" form of which we know nothing, yet I find difficulty in connecting the knowledge gained, according to Ritschl, in the exercise of faith, with theoretical knowledge. Can we not take yet a fourth position, namely, that a similar solution of the world-problem may be reached upon a philosophical basis? Could this be done, the unity of knowledge would be more faithfully preserved. I will now outline the way in which I think it may be done.

First of all, if philosophy be, as I think it is, self-knowledge in which is implied the knowledge of the world and God, an individual's attitude of reason in presence of ultimate problems that become conscious to him in his total

* Ibid, 200-211.

** Ibid, pp 222-3.

experience, the whole of this experience must form the data for his analysis and constructive theory which will be his philosophy. Nothing can be left out whether it be sensuous, theoretical, ethical or religious. Desiring to base philosophy upon a correct psychology, I must recognize the fact that it is a false psychology which restricts the moral to a partial self because the self is in its entirety a moral self.* How then can a philosophy which neglects the moral as a determining factor in the final significance of the experiences of self, world, and God, be the truth about reality?

Secondly, if I am to have knowledge of reality, I cannot go beyond my consciousness to reality to learn what reality is. External authority cannot tell. I must solve the problem of reality from the standpoint of self-conscious experience. Within this conscious experience, should not the most dominant factors, which are, at the same time, the most comprehensive and the most qualitatively valuable, be the criteria of what is real and true? But what is more vivid, what is more constantly present to dominate the whole range of human activity than the moral ideal? The deepest reflection pronounces the most valuable to be the finally real and the most valuable is the fellowship of personality with personality united by the bond of moral goodness and trust. Accepting this test of reality, this criterion of what must be believed in as real, who can say that the final unity of God, man and the world is not to be found in the fellowship of selves, of whom the divine Person is one, united by the bond of moral goodness and mutual trust, a unity by means of a common moral end?

Thirdly, I cannot accept terms in a system of philosophy which cannot be translated into conscious experience. For example, what is Hodgson's Unknown Power or Bradley's super-rational, super-moral Absolute? What is Power, what is Force, but action and what is it to act? Expressed in terms of the self-conscious experience which

* Ladd, *Philosophy of Conduct*, p 193.

is the basis of all philosophy, force, action, have no meaning except as they signify a self acting out its own will according to a conceived order of action. We might almost say that the whole of Bradley's argument turns upon his treatment of terms and their relations. He finds that relations always involve contradictions, that relations presuppose things and then, again, things presuppose relations. The student of Bradley's "Appearance and Reality" cannot avoid an uneasy feeling which arises, I think, from the fact that he is not convinced by the brilliant dialectic and yet he cannot readily refute it. Bradley's error, I think, consists in his neglect to keep close to actual experience. We do know both objects and relations as real—one as real as the other—but both objects and relations are constituted by and are existent for the knowing subject. For the subject, the objects are not first real, then related but the objects come into being as knowledge for the subject with their full complement of relations and we have no choice but to assume that this knowledge is of reality. And then, again, this term *super-rational*, *super-moral*, *super-personal*, and the attempt to think of the absolute experience as "somehow" a unity of the diversity of the world of "appearance" yet without its distinctions and relations. To me, these expressions are simply unmeaning. If it is the privilege of a philosopher when hard pressed to resort to the confession: "Somehow it must be, but I do not know how;" surely, this contains no reason why I should not with equal justification say: "Somehow the absolute is a moral personality in relation to finite moral agents whose sin and ignorance are their own though I do not know how." Certainly, I may say this if the whole range of my practical experience—my moral life—can find no other satisfying interpretation and grounding.

Fourthly, in support of my contention that morality is ultimate and is grounded in a divine moral Personality whose ends are realized in a society of moral selves, I

shall now indicate how I think Kant's real meaning should be interpreted, although I know there are different conceptions of what Kant taught. I think it is not far from the mark to say that Hodgson and Bradley base their negative positions upon the Critique of Pure Reason. I, however, believe that we do not reach Kant's real meaning till we consider his three critiques in unity. Of course, Kant's critics may hold that the Critiques of Pure and Practical Reason and of the Judgment do not form a unity. But as I read these works, the conviction is forced upon me that the three are intended as a unity. Indeed, in the Critique of the Pure Reason Kant repeatedly says that there may be other grounds upon which we may give content to the Ideas of Reason. I believe that in Kant's own mind the Critique of Pure Reason was only preliminary to a complete analysis of the whole life of mind—the whole man—and this too in subordination to the moral and religious interests. But in the history of philosophy, the Critique of Pure Reason has been given an undue prominence and made the basis of relativity in knowledge and even of agnosticism, while the Critique of the Practical Reason has been held to contradict that of the theoretical reason. On the other hand, the Critique of the Practical Reason has in its turn and in an independent manner influenced the advocates of the finality of moral and religious faith, for example, Ritschl. I think that this undue separation and apparent conflict of these two works has been largely on account of ignorance of the Critique of Judgment while it is said that "Kant himself regarded it as the coping-stone of his critical edifice. It even formed the point of departure for his successors, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, in the construction of their respective systems" (Intro. p. XII.)* And were not these systems dominated by the conception of unity? The implication is that the three Critiques of Kant form a unity—an analysis of the human mind in the entire range

* Kant's "Kritik of Judgment," Tr. by J. H. Bernard.

of its experience, namely, in its knowledge, in its volitions and in its feelings. Kant himself says that the Judgment forms a mediating link between Understanding and Reason, forming a unity. The question of the Critique of Judgment is whether the Judgment has *a priori* principles as well as the Understanding and the Reason and it is found to be so. Consequently, there are three sets of *a priori* principles discovered by the three Critiques. Why then are they not equally trustworthy and a system—a unity?

Moreover, in this Critique of Judgment I find that Kant makes the beautiful and the sublime serve the moral end and both tend to free us from the physical and the sensible and to lift us into the supersensible—the spiritual—indeed, to arouse the soul within us to a sense of its own spiritual destiny and bring us into relation to the Divine. Here again appears the unity of the whole life—from the Understanding, through the Judgment, to the Reason—all one but finding its culmination in the moral. Even “taste makes possible the transition, without any violent leap, from the charm of sense, to habitual moral interest” (252). In a section entitled, “The final purpose of the existence of the world, i. e., of creation itself,” Kant says: “Only in man . . . as subject of morality, do we meet with unconditioned legislation in respect of purposes, which therefore alone renders him capable of being a final purpose, to which the whole of nature is teleologically subordinated” (361). Again, as on the ground of natural purposes, we are led to the conception of a supreme intelligent cause, likewise “on the mere recommendation of the pure practical reason legislating for itself” (375), we are led to a “supreme cause governing nature according to moral principles.” Indeed, this supreme cause must also be conceived as moral (376).

As a passing remark, suppose we were to adopt Bradley's principle, in this connection, that “whatever is possible and must be certainly is,” we might stop here with

the moral interests supreme in all things, ultimate in nature, man and God. But we must not reach this conclusion too hastily. Kant next tells us that these lofty conceptions concerning the moral law and its implications—this belief in the supreme moral cause—rises up in us independently of the theoretical reason from the inner principle of the practical reason and that these conceptions do not need to be preceded by any theoretical conception of God, although the theoretical reason may serve to confirm and strengthen these conceptions after they have been first reached upon the moral basis (394). But I feel that Kant himself meant to give full and ultimate significance to morality. He says: "It is therefore the immanent principle of the mind to assume as true, on account of the obligation in reference to it, that which it is necessary to presuppose as condition of the highest moral final purpose" (410). And yet how can we escape disappointment when Kant also says "that no cognition whatever is possible of the supersensible in this way (of natural concepts)." (413)? We feel that this limitation of knowledge to concepts with sensuous content is an unfortunate barrier to the real Kant; our impulse is to take it away, removing at the same time the equally indefensible separation between phenomena and noumena and admit this grand system as final truth. Surely, Fichte and Hegel attempted to do these things. Kant's own words in the Critique of Pure Reason invite us to the undertaking when he says: "I call a concept problematical, if it is not self-contradictory, and if, as limiting other concepts, it is connected with other kinds of knowledge, while its objective reality cannot be known in any way. Now the concept of a noumenon, that is of a thing which can never be thought as an object of the senses, but only as a thing by itself (by the pure understanding) is not self-contradictory, because we cannot maintain that sensibility is the only form of intuition."**

* Müller's Translation of Critique of Pure Reason, Vol. II, p 221.

There may be an intuition other than sensuous which could give content even to a problematic concept, thus transforming a concept empty of sensuous content into real knowledge.

I am glad in this connection to have T. H. Green say: "Kant's great mistake lay in holding that the only objects of knowledge were objects of possible perception, from which it followed, since space and time were conditions of perception, that nothing could be known except under these conditions." In other words, it is not necessary to hold that conceptions must always admit of intuitionalizing in order to be knowledge. "Is not the true notion of 'faith' that it is the apprehension of objects which we *conceive* but cannot present in intuition, an apprehension of which the proper expression is not language but moral action" which, as it were, verifies the conception and confirms it as reality. "That which for man is true, man can verify;" but all verification does not lie in the possibility of perception" (Works, II. 240; II. 173-175).

Granting that the verification of the truth of conceptions does not always "lie in the possibility of perception" but may take place in connection with moral action, may we not accept the Kantian conceptions of the ultimate nature of morality, of the moral world-order, of the end of creation as consisting in the realization of the moral Kingdom, and of the supreme moral Intelligence, as verified in experience and so established as the truth about reality—indeed, as the finally real? But, if this be so, we have bridged over the chasm between the theoretical and the practical and incorporated moral experience in philosophy itself as its dominant and finally significant factor.

I have now indicated the point which I have desired to reach which is that a comprehensive examination of our entire experience, avoiding conceptions which have no meaning in that experience and giving full meaning to conceptions of chief importance, can have but one result,

namely: The ultimate worth of the moral even to the extent of grounding the moral in the nature of the universe and in the World-Ground as moral Personality in whom there is the perfect realization of the moral Ideal. As Kant said in the Critique of Judgment: "So soon as men begin to think upon right and wrong . . . this judgment is inevitable, namely, that the issue cannot be the same, whether a man has behaved fairly or falsely, with equity or with violence, even though up to his life's end, as far as can be seen, he has met with no happiness for his virtues, no punishment for his vices. It is as if they perceived a voice within (saying) that the issue must be different. . . . But they could never think any other principle of the possibility of the unification of nature with its inner ethical laws, than a supreme Cause governing the world according to moral laws" (391-2). This is precisely my point, the issue is not the same whether we behave fairly or falsely for we are moral selves—a society, forming a social unity in which the moral purposes of God are being progressively realized. Morality is not then a mere phase of an unknown Power, nor is it a mere "appearance" to be "transmuted" from the Absolute standpoint into something other than itself. We may, on the other hand, regard the moral ideal as a conception verified in moral action and thus know that the principles of morality are ultimate.

I would also call attention to a fifth consideration, as follows: I am confident that general metaphysics can only issue in such a conception of the World-Ground as will afford a satisfactory basis for the metaphysics of ethics. I do not think that the multiplicity and unity of reality, including processes of becoming and processes of knowing, can be understood on any but a conception of the World-Ground as the Will and Reason of an absolute Self. I have shown that the moral Ideal points to a divine Person realizing the supreme moral end in a social Kingdom. But, as the grounding of this conception, it

may be shown that the multiplicity of finite things and persons may indeed be manifestations—if you choose, creations—of the one World-Ground, yet constituted in their multiplicity and real differences what they are by the same act of this World-Ground which maintains the multiplicity in unity. “Not even the activity which renders it one would . . . be other than that which renders it many. On the contrary, by the very same act by which it constitutes the multiplicity, it opposes itself to this as unity, and by the same act by which it constitutes the unity, it opposes itself to this as multiplicity. Thus here, if anywhere, we expressly presuppose the essential unity of the subject to which we ascribe at once unity and multiplicity.”* All objections are based upon the law of identity; but this law is satisfied if the same predicate is not at the same time affirmed and denied of the subject but there is nothing in this law of ideality to prevent the same subject having at the same time many different predicates distinct and separate but constituted a unity in the subject by the same act that constitutes them a plurality.** What except self-conscious personality can thus realize and constitute both unity and multiplicity? Thus general metaphysics offers to the metaphysics of ethics the conception of the World-Ground as “Will informed and guided by Reason and immanent as progressively realizing its own ideas in all that of which we have experience”—i. e., the World-Ground must be conceived in terms of self-conscious Personality.”***

Why, then, may we not say that it belongs to the very nature of the Absolute to be a Person in relation to personalities constituted what they are by the divine agency but having assigned to them their activity as their own; that their individualities are not “transmuted” into something other than themselves in the divine experience

* Lotze, *Metaphysics*, Sec. 75.

** Ibid, Sec. 75, 76.

*** Ladd, *Philosophy of Conduct*, p 603.

and could not be thus "transmuted" because the sameness of God is the living identity of purpose which ceaselessly obtains realization only in a society of moral selves gaining victories and suffering defeats in the struggle to live according to what they call the morally right and good. It may be too much to say with Kant that the end of all things is the realization of the moral Ideal. I am content to know that the realization of this moral Ideal is at least one of the essential factors in the purpose of God whose full content no one can express. It is true that we cannot picture how these things can be. But I have shown that conceptions may be accepted as representing a necessary philosophical result which are not realizable in perception or representable in the imagery of perception but which, nevertheless, receive their verification in our living activity.

I am not unmindful of the difficulties connected with this final position concerning the ultimate significance of morality. But I have tried to show that it is not far from even philosophical truth to regard the moral law as the expression in us of the divine Life in whom the moral Ideal finds its perfect fulfillment. In any case, our intellectual representations do not exhaust the content of Reality which is richer than our thought. It even may be, as Ritschl suggests, that the soul in a unique experience, discovers the secret of humanity, of God and of the world, to be the blessedness of life in the divine Kingdom of moral selves. The eagerness to know the Holy One must recognize its limitations. As Paulsen says: "It is left to religion, the custodian of all mysteries, to reveal to the heart the hidden meaning of the world and of life." Perhaps this is better and more comforting than to know, for, as Goethe said: "It is the highest happiness of the thinking being to investigate what can be investigated and silently to adore what cannot be explained."*

* Paulsen, Introduction to Philosophy, p 14.

BOOK REVIEWS.

I. OLD TESTAMENT.

The Problem of the Old Testament.

By James Orr, D.D. Pages, 562, octavo, \$1.75. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1906.

Professor Orr's book is, all things considered, the most important book of the year in the Old Testament department. As a polemic against the Graf-Wellhausen theory of the Old Testament it is the most effective book of recent years. Both as critic and theologian, Dr. Orr stands midway between the brilliant Scotch professor and writer, James Robertson, and the learned Princeton professor and author, William Henry Green. The fact that Dr. Orr does not contend for a thoroughly inerrant Bible disarms the divisive critics of their favorite weapon in answering the lamented Dr. Green. The conservative conclusions of Prof. Orr are attained by purely critical processes, and not as the inevitable outcome of orthodox presuppositions. Professor James Robertson's lectures on the Early Religion of Israel did much to discredit the radical criticism in the minds of younger scholars in Britain and America, some of whom had not studied the writings of W. H. Green as carefully as they might have done. This new book by Dr. Orr bears on every page evidence of painstaking research and vigorous thinking. The note of downright sincerity is heard throughout all his discussion. He is as liberal toward the advocates of radical views as is possible without unfaithfulness to the truth. He never deals in unparliamentary epithets nor impugns motives, even when exposing the wildest critical extravagances. He is moved at times to raise the question whether the sense of humor is not becoming extinct—at least in the department of criticism. Once or twice

he almost invokes the spirit of Elijah that certain critical vagaries and foolish conceits may be consumed in the fires of the prophet's irony. We commend Dr. Orr for his self-control in holding himself steadily to the noble task of weighing arguments and estimating the value of critical theories and hypotheses.

The problem of the Old Testament, as Dr. Orr tells us in his introductory chapter, is twofold,—religious and literary. Is the *religion* which the Old Testament embodies merely a natural product of the development of the human spirit; or is it something more—a result of special, supernatural revelation to Israel, such as other nations did not possess? Then second, How are we to conceive of the *literature* itself, or of the books which make up the Old Testament, as respects their age, origin, mode of composition, trustworthiness, and, generally, their connection with the religion of which they are the monuments? Dr. Orr shows that the dependence of the literary criticism on the religious theory of the critic is very close, questions of date, genuineness and integrity being largely controlled by the view taken of the origin and course of development of the religion. The fundamental issue in the department of Old Testament study, according to Prof. Orr, is the question of the supernatural. Kuenen and other leaders of the radical school deny *in toto* the presence of the supernatural in history and in literature. Natural development without the intervention of the supernatural, according to Kuenen, will account for all the phenomena of Old Testament history and literature. Dr. Orr is willing for this rationalistic hypothesis to be brought to the test of experimental verification. Does Kuenen's theory work out easily and naturally in its application to the phenomena of Scripture? "With the best will in the world to explain the religious development of Israel out of natural factors, the efforts of the critics have resulted, in the view of many of themselves, in a magnificent demonstration of the immense, and, on natu-

ral principles, inexplicable difference between the religion of this obscure people and every other."

Prof. Orr feels constrained to call the reader's attention to the fact that the modern critical theory of the Old Testament was elaborated in rationalistic workshops, and that, from this circumstance, a certain rationalistic impress was stamped upon it from the first. The type of theory now dominant in critical circles is rationalistic in every fiber of its construction. Dr. Orr doubts the possibility of purging the Wellhausen theory of its rationalistic leaven, "without a complete recasting on principles which are the direct antitheses of those which obtain in the schools in which it originated." Our author puts the reader on his guard against certain writers who use the word "revelation" to express the peculiarity of Israel's religion, without, however, meaning to imply more than a certain providential guidance.

In the second chapter of his book, Dr. Orr takes a preliminary survey of the Old Testament itself, its structure, and the uniqueness of its history and religion. Such a survey, if intelligently and candidly conducted, always leads to substantially orthodox conclusions. The unity of the Bible is seen to be organic; the connection between the Old Testament and the New is shown to be vital and not mechanical; the Bible history is everywhere dominated by the idea of purpose, the very facts of the sacred history being the outward expression of the purpose of grace. Alike in what it has and in what it wants, the religion of the Old Testament is unique. From Abraham to the close of the Old Testament three great fundamental ideas distinguish the religion of Israel from the other religions of the ancient world: first, the doctrine of the unity of God, which was basal in Old Testament religion from the first; second, the unfolding of God's purposes of grace to the world; and third, the indissoluble relation the Old Testament establishes between religion and morality. The Old Testament claims to be a product

of special divine revelation. God made Himself known in both word and deed. Israel was conscious of being the possessor and guardian of a quite peculiar revelation from God. The literary record of this revelation has God for its inspiring source. The qualities ascribed to the Old Testament by 2 Tim. 3: 15-17 really inhere in it. It does the gracious work for which God gave it to men. It conducts us into the presence of Christ.

Perhaps the most original part of Dr. Orr's book is found in Chapters III-VI. The literary analysis of the Hexateuch into three main documents is provisionally accepted, and the author shows that, even on this basis, the essential outlines of the patriarchal and Mosaic history and the outstanding facts of the religion and institutions of the Old Testament cannot be overturned. The fact is freely admitted that most of the newer critics regard the Old Testament as in the main unhistorical. Prof. Orr accepts provisionally their analysis into documents and the dates commonly assigned, and then proceeds to establish the substantial trustworthiness of the Old Testament history, even under the limits prescribed by the critical hypothesis.

The teleological character of Hebrew history cannot be destroyed by literary analysis and manipulation, because it is ingrained into the very substance of the history, is part of its texture, like a watermark in paper. Moreover, if the plan inwrought into the history of Israel is an artificial one, where can we find the mind capable of inventing it?

Taking up the Hexateuch, our author presents the analysis into three main strands, apart from Deuteronomy, which is commonly assumed to be a composition of the age of Josiah. J stands for a prophetic writer living in Judah not later than 800 B. C., many critics placing him a good deal earlier. E stands for a prophetic writer living in Ephraim about 750 B. C., some critics placing him a century earlier. P is the symbol for the

priestly school of writers to whom we owe the Levitical legislation and most of the genealogies, etc. In its written form this legislation is held by most recent critics to belong to the post-exilian period.

Dr. Orr takes J and E as witnesses, and lets them tell the story of Israel's early history as they knew it. According to the great founders of the radical school, these two writings antecede the age of written prophecy, and embody the traditions current in Israel before Amos and Hosea began to prophesy. If so, then "the internal unity and teleological character so conspicuous in these narratives formed *an integral part of the tradition*, and was not put into it by later prophetic manipulation." Moreover this tradition as to Israel's early history had already assumed a quite developed and settled form; and according to the critics, we have two witnesses, and not merely one, for the facts of the patriarchal and Mosaic periods. "Criticism, therefore, if its division of these documents could be trusted, would furnish us with a powerful corroboration of the genuineness and fixed character of the tradition at a period not later than the ninth century B. C." Dr. Orr next takes the reader over certain stepping-stones to an earlier date of the tradition preserved in J and E. Such a tradition, with a stable form, must have come into existence before the division of the kingdom at the death of Solomon, since it is found in practically the same form in both North and South. Moreover many critics have suggested for J and E dates much earlier than 800 and 750 B. C. Under the influence of a new theory of religious development, the Wellhausen school has greatly lowered the dates for J and E. And we may be sure that two writers such as J and E are supposed to have been, belonging to "the golden age of Hebrew literature," were not the first Israelites to engage in historical composition. Leading critics like Kautzsch place much of the historical composition of the books of Samuel shortly after the reign of

Solomon, and some of the great poems are located farther back, the Song of Deborah in Judges V. being placed about 1250 B. C. Dr. Orr thinks it highly improbable that the history of David's reign should have been composed a century prior to the patriarchal and Mosaic history. He argues for a revision of the conceptions of the literary capabilities of the Mosaic age. From archæological discovery he brings forward corroborative evidence for the early date of the sources. He even dares to bring into court as witnesses the Biblical narratives themselves, pleading in their behalf that they ought to be heard with a *prima facie* presumption of their honesty. He quotes the passages that recount the literary activity of Moses, and affirms his conviction that much first-hand material from the Mosaic age is substantially preserved in the Pentateuch. "Even accepting the critical premises—in part by help of them—we are warranted in the belief to which we were led by the consideration of the organic and purposeful character of the Old Testament narrative itself, that it is a faithful representation of the actual course of the early history of the people."

The critical counter-theories are tested and found wanting, whether one tries them in their explanation of the course of the history or of the institutions of Israel. The theory that the patriarchs were not individuals but only "personifications" is confronted with the testimony of Israel's national consciousness. The same deep national consciousness proclaiming itself in history and prophecy and poetry attests the events of the Exodus and the deliverance at the Red Sea. "This knowledge dwells, not as a vague reminiscence, but as a strong, definite, historical assurance, in the heart of the nation, and it is as inconceivable that Israel should be mistaken about it, as that a grown man should forget the scenes of his boyhood, or episodes of his early life that burned themselves into his very soul."

The internal character of the narratives of the patriarchal period is adduced as a guarantee of their historicity. There is a notable paucity of miracles in Genesis, when, on the legendary theory, one would expect a superabundance of marvels. Moreover, there is a remarkable unity in the picture of the patriarchs in the various sources, and the sources are so interwoven as to constitute a compact single narrative of which the several parts imply, and depend on, each other. Our author thinks that the figure of Abraham as portrayed in Genesis might almost be adduced as of itself a guarantee of the historicity of the narrative in which it is embodied. The narratives in Genesis are faithful to patriarchal conditions in that the history keeps true to primitive conditions, the religious ideas and forms of worship, as well as the ethical conceptions, being such as would suit an early stage of revelation. The portraits of Moses and Aaron are the same in J, E, P, D, alike. It is one and the same Moses, with one and the same Aaron beside him.

The radical vice of the newer critical method, according to Dr. Orr, is its continual substitution of arbitrary conjecture for the facts of the history as given. He shows how advanced critics like Budde try to impose their theories on the Old Testament in the teeth of its own outcry against them. Thus Budde frankly admits concerning his view that Yahweh, a new god received by Israel at the Exodus, later on absorbed the Canaanite gods into his own person: "To be sure, neither the law, nor the historical narratives, nor the prophets, say a word of all this, yet it can be proved," etc. Professor Orr well adds: "Nearly anything, we imagine, could be proved in the same manner."

Dr. Orr presents in sharp contrast the Biblical and the critical views of the origin of monotheism in Israel and the customs of worship, with special treatment of image-worship in Israel. He shows that the religion of the chosen people from Abraham onward was a practical

monotheism, and that the critical view that the prophets of the eight century B. C. were the creators of ethical monotheism, is without warrant. He takes up in detail the critical notions of the large place in Israelitish worship ascribed to fetishism, animism, totemism, image-worship, ancestor-worship, tree- and stone-worship, human sacrifices, etc., and shows the weakness of their contention. "A dispassionate review, therefore, of this long catalogue of superstitions alleged to belong to pre-prophetic religion in Israel fails to establish the theory of the critics that any of them formed part of the genuine religion of Israel. They show abundant defec-tion in particular periods from the pure norm of that religion; but the evidence is overwhelming that they were foreign to the true genius of the religion, were condemned by its laws and by the prophets, and at no time received countenance from its great representatives."

In the sixth chapter Dr. Orr discusses the critical view of the ark, the tabernacle, the priesthood, etc. There is much keen dialectic in exposing critical inconsistencies in the treatment of the institutions of worship. On the one hand, the critics must agree with conservative scholars in exalting the personality and work of Moses in order to explain how it comes about that all the legis-lation in the Old Testament is connected with his name; on the other hand, they must minimize his influence almost to vanishing point, in order to make it credible that he really gave to Israel no laws at all—none at least of which we have any knowledge. Wellhausen contends that the prophets knew nothing at all about a ritual *torah* backed up by commands from Jehovah for its observance; and yet, according to the critical theory, Deuteronomy, which contains abundance of prescriptions and regula-tions about sacrifices, was already in existence before Jeremiah contrasted obedience with burnt-offerings and sacrifices. Already Dr. Orr cannot resist the temptation to point out the "difficulties and perplexities of the

critical hypothesis," a subject which he takes up more formally in Chapters VII.—X.

Chapter VII. first gives a lucid and eminently fair history of Pentateuchal criticism, which is followed by a statement of the difficulties of the critical hypothesis in general. Our author shows that doubt is awakened by the conflicts of opinion which the history of criticism itself discovers, and these differences are found among contemporary critics. "All this would matter little, if it were, as is sometimes said, mere variation on the surface, with slight bearing on the soundness of the theory as a whole. But it is far from that. The criteria which determine these judgments are found on inspection to go deep into the substance of the theory, and afford a valuable practical test of the principles by which it is built up." Attention is drawn to the undue multiplication of the hypothetical sources, J, E, P and R being each the general symbol for three or more writers living in different ages. The latest turn of the critics is to resolve these letters into symbols of *schools* of writers to which men living centuries apart belonged. This would seem to render worthless most of the painstaking investigation as to the individual style of P, J, E, D. Men of the same school may differ widely in vocabulary, syntax and all the higher elements entering into one's style of writing. This is a return to the old *fragmentary* hypothesis of Geddes and Vater, exploded so long ago. The firmly-knit character of the Pentateuch is the rock on which this fragmentary hypothesis must inevitably founder. "Its organic character bespeaks for it a higher origin than a concourse of literary atoms."

Professor Orr devotes more than a third of his book to the question of the literary analysis of the Hexateuch into documents. His provisional acceptance of the current analysis into documents enabled him to establish the general trustworthiness of the Bible history without attacking the literary partition of the critics. He shows that

their historical skepticism is not a necessary conclusion from their analysis and dating of documents. But having undermined the historical criticism, Dr. Orr next turns his attention to the literary criticism, and the divisive critics soon discover that their armor is weak in many places. First, as to J and E, are the critics right in distinguishing two documents at all? It would be difficult to find a better example of higher criticism than Dr. Orr's handling of this interesting inquiry. The reader must admire the breadth of view, the accuracy in details and the cogency of the arguments. The critics have not made good their view that J and E were originally distinct documents by different authors or schools of writers.

Chapter VIII. deals with the question of Deuteronomy, and the author insists on calling Old Testament critics to a fresh consideration of the question: "Is the Josaianic origin of Deuteronomy a result of scientific criticism which the impartial mind is bound to accept?" From the days of DeWette's epoch-making monograph on Deuteronomy (1805), many leading Old Testament scholars have started with this theory of the late origin of Deuteronomy as one of the assured results of scientific criticism. Dr. Orr's masterly discussion of this question would be a good chapter for the younger students to begin with. Lawyers, busy pastors and thoughtful laymen can appreciate the vigor of his attack on the very citadel of the critical position. His summary of conclusions on pp. 282-4, too long to quote here, contains nothing that is not fortified by strong arguments in the preceding discussion. "The book definitely gives itself out as a reproduction of the speeches which Moses delivered in the *Arabah* of Moab before his death, and expressly declares that Moses wrote his addresses ('this law'), and gave the book into custody of the priests." Dr. Orr accepts this as a true account of the origin of the book. "The literary gifts of Moses were amply adequate to the writing of his own discourses in their present form."

He shows his caution and moderation by adding: "This is not to deny editorial revision and annotation."

Chapters IX. and X. discuss at length the priestly writing, both the code and the document that contains it. The radical view of the gradual growth of priestly custom, hardening into obligation, and finally at a late date getting itself written down in small codes which were united into the priestly document after the Exile, all this is shown to be not the necessary conclusion from a minute study of the priestly writing itself and a comparison with the facts of history, but a hypothesis inadequately supported by arguments. P never existed as a separate document, and its history is trustworthy, and its laws early.

Here, as everywhere in his book, Dr. Orr shows a most comprehensive grasp of the problem to be discussed and an acquaintance with the literature of criticism that would make good, if it could be called in question, his statement that his interest in Old Testament Criticism, first aroused forty years ago, has never flagged. For conducting such an inquiry as he has given the world in the *Problem of the Old Testament*, he is in some respects better equipped than the best of the professors who claim to be experts in Higher Criticism. His vision is wider, and more of the judicial attitude is possible to him, as a worker in other fields of investigation, than is discoverable in the productions of modern Old Testament critics whether radical, mediating, or conservative.

The chapter on Archæology and the Old Testament is judicious and informing. He does not overstate the apologetic value of the facts. The closing chapter on the Progressiveness of Revelation is a fitting climax to an epoch-making book on the Old Testament. The younger scholars who have not been able to follow Wellhausen, nor even Dillmann and Driver, will take fresh courage from the entrance of such a strong, sane and well furnished champion of the Old Testament into the arena. We thank God for the work Dr Orr has already done for

the cause of evangelical religion, and pray God for a lengthening of his days.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

An American Commentary on the Old Testament. LEVITICUS AND NUMBERS.

By George F. Genung, D.D. Pages 108 and 144, octavo, paper. Postpaid, \$2.12. American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.

Dr. Genung has produced a most interesting and readable commentary on the books of Leviticus and Numbers. He is master of a pleasing English style, and his commentary leads the reader straight on as if he were perusing a volume of entertaining lectures and essays rather than a commentary. Our author is almost always happy in his manner of putting things when he gives us the fruit of his own first-hand studies. We cannot say as much for him when he seeks to align himself with those who accept the modern critical view of the Pentateuch. He seems to think it necessary to take at least a little of this medicine, but he almost invariably makes a wry face as he swallows it, and some at least of his readers will imitate him as they try to dispose of the considerable modicum of this medicine which he passes on to them.

He accepts the theory of different documentary strata in the Pentateuch. He seems to have followed, for the most part, the mediating critics rather than the thoroughly radical school. The author has too much religion and good sense to follow the more skeptical wing of the critics. At the same time, our author's position is removed quite a long way from that of the old orthodoxy. Writing of the Levitical regulations, Dr. Genung says: "It is not impossible that Moses, the great founder of the nation, may have given to some of these laws the sanction of his authority. It was not the habit of the priest in precritical times to inquire closely into the authorship of what had come down to him as established and sacred. Custom soon hardened into obligation, and any precept whose lifetime ran back beyond the memory

of man would be as a matter of course endowed with the prestige of that great name which had given such a mighty initial impulse to the nation's life. It was therefore the most natural thing in the world for a writer or redactor, in codifying the temple usages which had existed from time immemorial, to introduce each new topic or section with the recognized legal formula, 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying.' The book of Leviticus may therefore be said to be Mosaic in that it is the literary precipitate of Moses' work and of its continuation through the priestly activity which took its rise from the Mosaic tabernacle system and fulfilled itself in the nation's religious life."

Our author accepts Driver's view that by 444 B. C., Leviticus had received almost its present form: "The priest code would thus serve its purpose as the backbone of the post-exilic reformation." While recognizing much in the modern documentary theory that one may well hesitate to accept, Dr. Genung remarks: "Nevertheless that the germs of the priest-code existed and were a living influence in those circles to which its legislation applied, in times long anterior to the prophets, though subject to growth and modification as the religious problems of the nation advanced in complexity, is a fact which must be evident from a careful and unprejudiced study of the history." Our author in a good many places follows the logic of his critical premises to its inevitable conclusion in a much lower estimate of the Levitical law than we are accustomed to expect in a reverent and safe commentator.

In the Introduction to Numbers, Dr. Genung commits himself with even more assurance to the modern documentary theory of the Pentateuch. He is of opinion that the book was wrought into its final shape long after the period of which it treats. He finds a radical difference in the point of view regarding the hierarchy between the history and Deuteronomy on the one hand, and the

priestly legislation on the other, and argues that all the earlier history of Israel developed in the ignorance or entire absence of any organic law embodying these arrangements of the Priest Code. He sums up the matter as follows: "The probability emerging from the comparison of details which present themselves from various parts of the Old Testament appears to be: that the completed temple organization and ritual, including the relegation of the Levites to the position of subordinate helpers in the temple, did not come into force until after the exile; and that in the books of Leviticus and Numbers which, availing themselves of ancient materials, were put into shape after that period, these priestly arrangements were ascribed to Moses through a use of legal formulas or fictions which was a common literary procedure among the nations of antiquity." Of these "legal formulas or fictions" in literature worthy of study we have little or no objective proof. It is a fancy spun out of whole cloth by modern Old Testament critics.

Before our author lays down his pen he seems almost tempted to abjure analytical criticism altogether and lead his readers in the study of the book of Numbers as we have it before us. For such a delightful excursion as this it would be difficult to find a better guide than Dr. Genung. Referring to the critical dissection of books, the author remarks: "But we dissect only the dead body; and we must not think that dissection of the dead can give the same results as communion with the living. May the day be far distant when the Bible shall become for Western Christendom only a cadaver, the prey of dissection and analysis and criticism, a thing to be endlessly studied about, but never to be studied or communed with in its own living body and spirit. It will do the full good which its divine Inspirer intended only as it is a live book, a speaking companion, approached and appreciated through the naïve power to merge the willing mind in its

current of thought and imagery which the coldly critical habit can only do us infinite harm by taking away. Thus read and appreciated, not the least inspiring and vitally helpful of the sixty-six books in our canon will be found to be the divinely given book of Numbers."

That the author of the Pentateuch may have used much documentary material already to hand no conservative critic would be at the pains to disprove; it is altogether likely that both oral and written tradition furnished materials for Genesis. An eye-witness tells us the story from Exodus to Deuteronomy. The hero and the responsible author of these four books is none other than Moses the Lawgiver. Dr. Genung is too good a literary critic not to tremble when he undertakes the dissection of a book like Numbers, for he is engaged in vivisection. According to his own testimony, the Bible is a live book; why apply to it the knife of modern analytical criticism—unless it be to remove some parasitic growth inimical to the life of the Book?

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Old Testament Introduction. General and Special.

By John Howard Raven, D.D. 362 pages, octavo, \$2.00. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 1906.

Dr. Raven is Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, at New Brunswick, N. J. He has given to the friends of the Old Testament a handy volume in which the latest theories of the divisive critics are fairly stated and answered. He deals in argument rather than ridicule or invective. "As far as possible the arguments of the liberals are given in their own words, not only to conserve fairness but to encourage the student to read the opposite side of the case." Professor Raven seems eminently fair in his statement of the modern critical view, and his arguments in refutation of their theories are usually cogent and convincing. He stands with Keil and W. H. Green squarely confronting the divisive

critics with an affirmation of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the Davidic authorship of many Psalms, the unity of Isaiah and the genuineness of the book ascribed to Daniel.

Dr. Raven first treats of the Canon and the Text of the Old Testament. He calls in question many theories that have been so often affirmed and reiterated by the divisive critics that they have become earmarks of critical orthodoxy. He holds that the Old Testament canon was closed about 400 B. C. He challenges the testimony of the Septuagint and other ancient versions when they do not agree with the Hebrew text. Like Dr. Green, he is so straight in his textual conservatism that he almost leans back. Better this than the unbridled license of conjectural emendation into which many recent critics have plunged.

Professor Raven properly devotes more than three-fourths of his book to Special Introduction, in which he takes up the Old Testament books one by one and discusses the name, author, purpose and mode of composition, and presents an outline of the book. The work is well done, and most of the questions that an inquiring student would raise, receive an adequate treatment. We know of no book that seems better adapted to start the young theological student on the right road through the forest of Higher Criticism. JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Studies in the Book of Psalms.

By Lincoln Hulley, Ph.D. Pages, 178. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 1906.

Professor Hulley, in response to many requests for printed copies of his lectures on the Psalms, which have been delivered to interested audiences in various parts of America, has published this entertaining little volume. The opening lecture on Hebrew Poetry urges the importance of a new vocabulary for describing the linguistic and literary phenomena of Hebrew literature. "To call

Job a tragedy and Solomon's song a comedy is literary trifling and is confusing." He prefers to call Job a didactic poem and Solomon's Song an idyl. The author does not discuss the recent theories as to the regular recurrence of the same number of accented syllables in successive lines, resulting in trimeters, pentameters, etc.

Dr. Hulley is often happy in giving fitting titles to the various psalms. Thus Psalm 14 is "The Fool's Creed," Ps. 19 "The Heavens are Telling," Ps. 49 "Dives and Lazarus," Ps. 100 "Jubilate." In the lecture on the traditional setting of Psalms our author shows his decided leaning to moderately conservative views. He ascribes Ps. 110 to David, but singularly enough makes the psalm only typically Messianic. "While its fullest import is Messianic, still Jesus Himself said that David wrote it, and it was primarily of David, the Lord's anointed." If our Saviour's authority suffices to make one accept David as the author of Ps. 110, it ought also to show us that David was writing not of himself primarily but of the Messiah. "Jehovah said unto my Lord." The argument of Jesus against the Pharisees rests upon two assumptions; that David wrote Ps. 110, and that he addressed his son the Messiah as his Lord. Hence the primary and sole reference is to the Messiah, who is both king and priest.

In the long chapter on Fifteen Psalm Groups there is much helpful comment. The least satisfactory in tone and temper is the discussion of the Imprecatory Psalms. The author does full justice to the strength and horror of the maledictions, and one expects to hear him cry out for the excision of all these prayers against foes. There is truth in his view that these curses are on the lower level attained by Old Testament saints. Jesus requires us to pray for those who persecute us, and his own example on the cross makes it plain that he meant what he said. Maclaren is much more happy in his manner of advocating this view, for he does full justice to the love of

righteousness in the heart of the excited and indignant psalmists.

Dr. Hulley appends the outline of ten class studies in the Psalms. Under his capable leadership such studies would be very stimulating and informing.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Studies in the Book of Job.

By Francis N. Peloubet, D.D. Pages, 115, octavo, \$1.00 net. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1906.

Dr. Peloubet as the author of annual select Notes on the International Lessons has won a large place for himself in popular Bible study. He has prepared this admirable manual on Job for advanced classes in the Sunday-school, for Bible classes in high schools and colleges, for evening services, and for individual use. He agrees with Carlyle that the Book of Job is "one of the grandest things ever written with pen." While not neglecting the critical questions concerning Job, the author has placed the main emphasis on "the book as it is now, on the inspiring, invigorating, transforming, comforting teachings found therein. It is not the history of the violin we here want, but the music." The author's aim is "to awaken fresh interest in the book itself; to open the doors to its greatness and glory as literature; to open windows to its blessed and comforting truths; to bring its consolations to the perplexed and suffering; to apply its character-forming elements and power." Right well does Dr. Peloubet succeed in his noble aim.

The book contains a full bibliography and complete indexes. Great skill is manifest in the paragraphing, analytical outlines, use of different fonts of type, diagrams, etc. Dr. Peloubet has read widely in the world's best literature, and he lays everything under tribute to illustrate the problem of the Book of Job, and yet nothing is lugged in for the sake of display.

Dr. Peloubet accepts the unity of the Book of Job, and places the book at an early date, probably at some period in the age of the Judges. "There is no great poem extant of which it can be shown that it was composed by several authors at different periods." One of the best features of our author's discussion is the skill with which he relates each division of the Book of Job to the great problem of human suffering. Be wise, ye pastors and teachers, and get this book. JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Hand-Book of Prophecy.

By James Stacy, D.D. Pages, 149, octavo, 60 cents net. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. 1906.

The author of this treatise makes a special study of the predictions in Daniel and the Revelation. He arrives at the conclusion that the Millennium cannot be very far off. He ventures to name 2,000 A. D. as the date. In the second part of the book he attacks vigorously the premillennial theory of our Lord's Second Coming. The book is supplied with charts and chronological tables.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Methodism and Biblical Criticism.

By Prof. Milton S. Terry, D.D., LL.D. Reviewed by Evangelist L. W. Munhall, M.A., D.D. Winona Publishing Co, Chicago. Pages, 63.

A fierce attack on the divisive critics in Methodist universities and theological seminaries by an earnest, aggressive evangelist.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

II. HOMILETICAL.

The Modern Pulpit. A Study of Homiletic Sources and Characteristics.

By Lewis O. Brastow, D.D., Professor of Practical Theology, Yale University. New York. The Macmillan Company. \$1.50 net.

Readers of Dr. Brastow's former work, "Representative Modern Preachers," will be glad to welcome this new

fruitage of his studies in Homiletics. The excellent qualities of the former work are here repeated. Dr. Brastow is a thoughtful student of preaching. His critical insight is penetrating, his judgment balanced and sane, his exposition lucid and informing. If it seems sometimes, that he rather overdoes the niceties of critical distinction and elaboration, that only means that one is sometimes apt to work his strong point a little too hard. The book gives a discriminating and valuable study of great and important sections of modern Protestant preaching. The author gives in the preface his reasons for omitting the Catholic pulpit and the modern French pulpit, and thus forestalls inevitable criticism. The discussion is accordingly devoted to the Protestant pulpit of Germany, Great Britain and the United States. For German preaching Rothe's *Geschichte der Predigt*, and the great article by Christlieb in *Herzog*, together with some other authorities, have been freely used and suitably acknowledged, so that the author's treatment of modern German preaching, while luminous and suggestive, is confessedly not altogether first-hand work. But when Dr. Brastow comes to the modern British and American pulpit, one recognizes in his work the sure touch of personal mastery and of power. So much by way of general criticism.

For contents, Dr. Brastow discusses in his first three chapters the influences and characteristics of modern preaching. Taking the preparative influences of the Eighteenth century as a starting point he discusses the influence of Pietism in Germany, and the Puritan and Methodist movements in England. The Great Awakening in this country also receives some notice. Movements of the intellectual life, Philosophy, History and Literature in the Eighteenth century, are unfolded in their relations to preaching. The prominent influences of the Nineteenth century are also carefully studied and developed with fine historic and critical insight. A mere statement of the topics discussed indicates the range of the author's

thought and treatment; (1) Development of Physical Science. (2) Influence of Modern Philosophy. (3) Development of Historic and Critical Science. (4) Literary Development. (5) Awakening of the Religious Life. (6) Influence of the Complex and Practical Character of Modern Life. All these points are thoughtfully and admirably discussed and appreciated. In noting the prominent characteristics of modern preaching, our author discusses its experimental qualities, its historical and Biblical basis, its critical and discriminating character, its practical character, and its qualities of form. Here again the discussion is very satisfactory.

In his study of English and American preaching especially, Dr. Brastow has made a notable contribution to the literature of Homiletics. His criticism and appreciation of the Anglican pulpit, the preaching of the English free churches and Scottish preaching are of a very high order.

In characterizing the Anglican preaching, Dr. Brastow wisely states the difficulty of making broad generalizations where so much variety is found, but he does admirably what he undertakes. The three schools of English Theological thought, High, Low and Broad Church, are discriminatingly considered, and criticisms are made upon the Anglican pulpit in general. Dr. Brastow thinks that the English church has not always had a sufficient appreciation of pulpit work as such, notwithstanding the great number of really great preachers who have adorned its annals. He also points out the conventionality of Anglican preaching. He further notes what he calls "an inadequate or defective teaching basis," which is followed by a defective aim, and finally by a slight regard for homiletic form. Excellent criticisms and estimates, with only minimum biographical notice are given to some of the great British preachers. Several of these have received larger treatment in Dr. Brastow's other book and are here only referred to.

The preaching of the United States receives careful and discriminating study, but it seriously lacks breadth and proportion. The general qualities of American preaching are given as being a high estimate of the preacher's function, intellectual virility, practical quality, and variety. These points are well taken and are discussed with vigor and sanity. One could wish that a little more attention had been given to the evangelistic and evangelical elements of American preaching, and to the spiritual and ethical value of these as forces in our national life. In discussing sectionalism as a note of variety in our preaching Dr. Brastow wisely generalizes thus (p. 331): "The prominence, then, of the intellectual quality in the preaching of the north, of the practical quality in that of the west, and of the emotional quality in that of the south may roughly, but of course inadequately, characterize their varieties of type." This is well said, and the intimation that enrichment in all these qualities would mark improvement in all sections cannot be gainsaid. When, however, our author, after some just remarks on southern preaching, proceeds to say that as compared with that of the north it is "less distinctly marked by intellectual deliberateness, independence and virility," we may accept the first word, demur to the second, and simply wonder at the third. How much southern preaching must one have heard or read to think that it lacks "virility"? Again, in criticising western preaching, our author is hardly correct in esteeming it deficient in catholicity, independence and progressiveness as compared with that of the east.

The author seeks to disarm criticism in his selection of preachers for treatment; and it must in fairness be said that this is an exceedingly difficult matter in a study of this kind, where so much must be left to the individual taste, predilections and information of the author. But admitting all this, it does not seem to this reviewer that Dr. Brastow has made his field of vision wide enough, or

has been quite successful in his choice of subjects within his limits. Among Baptists, for instance, the men selected are: Wayland, Wm. R. Williams, Richard Fuller, E. G. Robinson, W. N. Clarke, W. H. P. Faunce, R. S. MacArthur and Russell H. Conwell. These are, of course, eminent Baptists, and some of them representative preachers, but the list cannot be said to indicate a very broad survey of, or thorough acquaintance with, the American Baptist pulpit as a whole. The omission of John A. Broadus, for example, who is not mentioned anywhere in the book, will strike many readers as a very singular one. And another curious thing is the failure to mention among Presbyterians and Methodists, or Episcopalians any southern man. A survey of American preaching which takes no account of such men as Thornwell, Plumer, Hoge or Palmer; or of Bascom, Pierce, Marvin or McTeiye; or of Dudley, Randolph or Gailor has certainly not fully covered its field. Dr. Richard Fuller is the only southern Baptist named, but here at least the choice was eminently correct even if the appraisal leaves something to be desired. No western preacher is noticed. It is true that the South and West have not furnished many published sermons for the literature of the subject, but they have furnished some, and their preaching and preachers have been too large and great a power in the religious life of the United States to be passed over in a general survey of American preaching. The time is long passed when any corner of this country can be justly even if unconsciously taken for the whole of it.

Our author is happier in his treatment of denominational varieties in our preaching. His estimate of the preaching of each denomination as a whole is prefixed to the mention of individual representatives. His broad and discriminating study is here especially in evidence. It is gratifying to note the high estimate placed upon Baptist preaching, which he finds to be especially strong in its

emphasis upon the Bible, its evangelistic and experimental qualities, and its marked variety.

The book is an exceedingly valuable contribution to the literature of Homiletics and the few things to which this reviewer has felt called upon to make exceptions are upon the whole, only slight drawbacks in a work of exceeding value and timeliness. The book ought to be in the library of every preacher and carefully studied by all who desire to know anything of the characteristics and power of modern preaching, particularly in England and the United States.

E. C. DARGAN.

Listening to God.

By Hugh Black. Fleming H. Revell Co.

Rev. Hugh Black was for ten years pastor of St. George's United Free Church, Edinburgh, Scotland. He is now professor of pastoral theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

This is a volume of sermons, twenty-seven in all, preached to his old charge, Edinburgh. The title of the first sermon, from the text, "I will incline mine ear to a parable," Ps. 49:4, is the title of the volume. And a good one it is.

Perhaps none of us ever picks up a volume of sermons with the intention of reading all of them. We look over the table of contents and select the subjects and texts that strike us as interesting, thus "tasting the sermons," and reading what we like. I warn you, if this is your custom, that you will not get off so easily with this volume. It will seize you at once and hold you in its grip till you have read the last word.

Delightful sermons! Simple, good sermons! Sermons that stir mind and heart! You are in your own pew—feel that you are one of Mr. Black's congregation—and open ears and heart to the word of God. When the sermon is over you regret that it was so short, but you feel grateful to the preacher for the helpful message. He has

helped you wonderfully and you have a desire to tell him so. If his eyes should chance to fall upon this poor appreciation, I beg him to accept my thanks.

I wondered when I opened the volume if I should have to listen to a lot of worldly wisdom, apologies for the faith, and denunciations of the foe. So many good sermons have bad spots in them. The preacher carries us along with him; every minute his sermon grows better; but just when we feel sure of a feast of good things, he steps aside to display a little learning, or to strike a blow or two at a foe a thousand miles away. This discourages us—never feel sure of him again.

Well, Mr. Black did not disappoint me. I found no bad spots. He carried me right along, never turning to the right nor the left. It was the Lord and the Lord's business all the time. He seemed *determined* to know nothing but Christ and Him crucified. He never let me get away from the awful reality of sin and the glorious reality of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ. He did not pause to tell me that great scholars have rejected such and such passages; nor that I must reconstruct my views of this or that doctrine. And think of this. He took a text from Isaiah and never said a word about "the two Isaiahs!" Right onward he went bearing the whole Bible aloft, a blazing torch of divine truth. And I followed to the end, ever more pleased and edified.

Here is a fine example of good preaching. The pulpit is no place for airing our learning—nor the learning of others. Neither is it a place for refuting our opponents, nor for slaughtering our enemies. Preach the gospel as it bears on all the problems of life. Preach it plainly, simply, earnestly, lovingly. Tell the people about Jesus. Tell them something they can do for Him, and for His people, and for this poor sinful world. The people are tired of philosophy, and word-battles, and "book learning." They want to hear about Jesus and duty and heaven!

These are the best sermons I have read in many a day—I can't say that I ever read better ones. As Mr. Black teaches the young preachers of Union Seminary I sincerely hope that he will be able "to show them how!"

J. P. GREENE.

Rudolf Hermann Gurland.

Von Lic. Joh. de le Roi, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1906. 80 pf.

This little "brochure" of seventy pages gives account of the life and labors of a converted Jewish Rabbi, largely among his own people in Germany and parts of Russia. Gurland sprang from a Jewish family who lived in Holland, of whom some had been Christians. His father was a teaching Rabbi in Wilna. Gurland was himself brought up a Jew and became assistant Rabbi to his uncle in Limburg. His studies led him to question some of the principles of the Jewish faith, especially of the reformed wing. He resigned his office and gave himself to literary pursuits. In 1862 he got hold of a Hebrew New Testament and fell under the influence of a German military chaplain by the name of Faltin, in Kischineff, yet at the same time became rabbi of a Jewish congregation in that city. After a while he was converted to the Christian faith and received baptism at the hands of Faltin. He pursued his studies for a while and determined to devote himself to preaching the gospel among his own people. He attended the Mission House and the University at Berlin for several years and went back to Kischineff where he assisted Faltin with special relations to work among the Jews. He continued in these labors for some years with varying success, when he went as a traveling missionary. In 1876 he became pastor of the Lutheran Church in Mitau where he labored for twenty years. The latter part of his life he gave to traveling and missions among his own people, dying in great peace of mind in the year 1905. No statistical account is given of his suc-

cesses, but a number of Jews were led to Christ through him. His character was mild and loving. He did not argue so much with his compatriots, but sought to win them with love and Christian living. A number of touching incidents are given in his book of conversions of Jews of all classes to Christianity. The narrative is simply told and makes both interesting and easy reading.

E. C. DARGAN.

Rests by the River. Devotional Meditations.

By George Matheson, D.D. New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son. \$1.25.

Those who have found help and spiritual enjoyment in Dr. Matheson's *Hours of Retirement* and similar books need only be told that here is another of the same sort. There are short meditations, the first part exposition and thought, which glide into prayer in the second part. Thought and devotion mingle in a style clear, sweet, appropriate to its purpose. It is a delightful book to keep at hand for use in one's morning or evening devotions. Each meditation may be read in a few minutes; and they need not be read consecutively. Sometimes one must demur emphatically to the author's fanciful and forced interpretation of Scripture, but this does not often happen. The book, with its companions, must continue to hold high place in devotional literature, and bring rest and comfort to many a soul.

E. C. DARGAN.

The Social Message of the Modern Pulpit.

By Charles Reynolds Brown, Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Oakland, Cal. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.50.

This volume constitutes the Yale Lectures on Preaching for the year 1905-6. In the preface, the author states that the subject grew out of his experience as a pastor and preacher. The first two lectures deal (1) with the demand for preaching adapted to the social questions of the day and the need of the pulpit's adjustment of itself to modern social life, and (2) with how this can be done

best through expository preaching, which gives alike the advantage of scriptural authority, of freshness, and of opportunity to deal directly and pointedly with many problems and evils. In lectures three to seven, inclusive, the author seeks to illustrate his thesis by using the Book of Exodus. He takes up first the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt as a type of the oppression of the laboring class in modern times. He shows how the call and training of Moses illustrates the need of competent leadership in social reforms. In the exodus itself he finds instruction as to the need of a complete change in social environment in order to secure the best social results. In the forty years' wandering is shown the need of the industrial training of a people for higher achievements. In the moral and ceremonial teachings of the law a new social order is set forth as an ideal. In the closing lecture, VIII. Dr. Brown discusses the best lines by which a modern minister should approach the discussion of social questions. These he finds to be the exaltation of the spiritual above the material, the growth of an intelligent good will, the shaping of public opinion, the recognition of the will of God, and the emphasis upon the deeper sources of motive for social effort.

The author's style is clear and unpretentious, but vigorous. You have no difficulty in seeing his meaning. The thought recommends itself by its balance and grasp; it does not surrender to the extremists and the agitators. Dr. Brown shows that both capital and labor have their faults and sins, that Socialism cannot be a panacea for all ills; yet he has strong words to say against all oppression, selfishness, trickery in our social and commercial life. Insisting upon the social and ethical message and duty of the pulpit, our author earnestly asserts that he does not minimize the spiritual and evangelical estimates of the gospel, yet it seems hard to escape the appearance of doing in effect what is thus earnestly disclaimed in intention. But of course, here as elsewhere, there is much

room for difference in point of view. One must sometimes take exception to the author's critical position, so far as this is indicated. He seems at times to go further with the radical school of critics than is consistent with the thorough acceptance of the supernatural in the Bible. Again, in applying the teachings of the book of Exodus to modern social conditions, the preacher sometimes gets far away from his base. He is much more vigorous in his application than accurate in his exegesis. Thus, for example, in making the sacrifices of the Mosaic law teach the duty of self-sacrifice for the social good, our author is far off the mark. There are other examples of such forcing of Scripture. In the main, however, the book is suggestive, stimulative to thought, and helpful in hints as to method and spirit in dealing with the problems of the present.

E. C. DARGAN.

The Orbit of Life. Studies in Human Experience.

By Wm. T. Herridge, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, Toronto.

This little volume of 147 pages contains a series of brief addresses or sermons in which many vital themes are discussed. Among the titles of the chapters are the following: Prospective, Appreciation, Love's Thoroughfare, Self Mastery, The Triumph of Joy, The Two Bodies: an Easter Study. The author is gifted with a clear and flowing style. He has warm sympathy with human life in its struggles, and he exhibits much insight into the spiritual conditions which attend our moral progress. Many will find inspiration and profit in the perusal of these papers.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Evolution of a Christian.

By David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D., Minister of Marble Collegiate Church, New York. American Tract Society, New York. \$1.00.

This is a series of sermons, or rather sketches of sermons, preached by Dr. Burrell in his own pulpit and aft-

erwards published. The publication was due to a request from Dr. Klopsch, of the *Christian Herald*, that the author should prepare for publication a treatise on the Steps to the Christian Life. Thus the sermons discuss such practical themes as: How to Begin, How to Hear, How to See, How to Grow, Tests of Profession, Tests of Faith, Character, Honesty, the Secret of Power, Failure, Steadfastness, and others. The characteristics of the sermons are not hard to see, for there is no subtlety to baffle, no great depth to require hard thinking, no great originality to startle. Everything is clear—thought, style, purpose. Here is true conviction of the old-time realities, traditional orthodoxy strongly and frankly held, and with no apology to anybody for saying in a simple and manly way what the man really believes. The thought is scriptural, the illustration sufficient, abundant, apt, modern. The style is lucid, appropriate, direct, easy. The aim is loyalty to Christ and Truth, benefit and help to man. It is a good book. Read it. E. C. DARGAN.

III. COMPARATIVE RELIGION AND MISSIONS.

Comparative Religion. Its Genesis and Growth.

By Louis Henry Jordan, B.D. (Edin.), Late Special Lecturer in Comparative Religion at the University of Chicago, with an Introduction by Principal Fairbairn, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Pp. XIX, + 668. \$3.50 net.

This work is welcome to all workers in the relatively new field of Comparative Religion. It admirably supplements—it does not substitute—Professor Jastrow's *Study of Religion*, on which this author extensively depends for confirmation.

Mr. Jordan has maintained throughout a scholarly and judicial attitude in a field where he has made laborious and painstaking investigation. That he has not gotten at all the facts will be evident enough and it is to be regretted that injustice is done in some omissions from his

tables of institutions setting forth a summary of their interest in Comparative Religion.

Taking a look at the contents of the volume we find a needlessly overgrown *preface* which is on this account dignified by the title *Introduction*. Part I. is *Prolegomena* in three chapters, the most discursive, least direct and least attractive of the book but serving to set forth the defense of this *Science* and its "method," "aim and scope."

Part II. sets forth the "Historical Preparation" for the Science of Religion by accounting historically and critically for "Its Tardy Genesis" (chap. IV.), and by presenting "Its Prophets and Pioneers" (chap. V.) Here are included all workers in this field up to 1850. A judicious estimate of the work of each of these with his value to the study is set forth briefly and with due deference to the estimates of other writers but with the assurance and dignity of independent judgment.

Part III. is much more extensive—seven chapters with more than 300 pages. The chapter headings will best show the author's method of dealing with the subject: VI. Its Founders and Masters; VII. Its Several Schools; VIII., IX., Its Auxiliary Sciences; X., Its Mental Emancipations; XI., Its Tangible Achievements; XII., Its Expanding Bibliography.

In discussing the "schools" of students and writers our author makes division into three, a Revelation School, an Evolution School, and a Composite School. He points out the defects and insufficiencies of the first two and the merits of the third. In common with most liberal writers the views of the "Revelationists" are here exhibited in a way to make them at once absurd for any modern student and there is scant justification for finding such a school at all, especially if attention is confined to the period since 1850, as is here done. Mr. Jordan is quite superior to Professor Jastrow in recognizing the validity of "supernatural" elements in the final judgments of the

Science of Comparative Religion. Even here, however, we find the "scientific" tendency to ignore the "supernatural" in making up the scientific system. Certainly it is true that the admission of the "supernatural" is the introduction of a troublesome factor, troublesome because its laws are unknown and its effects not exactly ponderable; and if science is to be complete and exact no such elements must intrude. But if the "natural" factors fail to account for all the facts of the science to ignore another factor that would account for them is not quite "scientific" even though something of the appearance of completeness is lost by the consideration. Astronomy seeks the unknown planet or star that is a "disturbing" factor in its calculations and admits—aye insists on—its actuality even if undiscovered and not yet weighed and catalogued. The Science of Religion can afford, as a science purely, to adopt a similar course. Can it afford not to do so? In noting the achievements and cataloguing the bibliography the author does not proceed along the lines of his "schools" but divides geographically. This part of the work is highly interesting and helpful. Indeed the whole work is, in the main, most fascinating.

In the making of a book one accumulates a good deal of material that does not find place in the orderly progress of the work. Some writers cannot endure the "loss" of this material and so "*append*" it in a lot of fine print notes. We have ninety pages of such "Notes" served up to us in this work.

There are some religious study charts with explanatory notes. These are illuminating and instructive but not based on thoroughly scientific principles. Especially with reference to China is it a mistake to undertake to assign definite millions as adherents of the various religions, the total exactly equaling the estimated population of the Empire.

The index is extensive and most valuable.

It is a good promise that this volume is to be followed

shortly by two others on the same general subject, treating respectively "*The Principles and Problems*," and "The Opportunity and Outlook" of Comparative Religion.

W. O. CARVER.

What is Japanese Morality?

By James A. R. Scherer, President of Newberry College, Author of "Young Japan," "Japan of Today," "Four Princes," etc. Philadelphia. The Sunday School Times Co. 1906. Pages, 90. Price, 75 cents, postage paid.

Confessedly Japanese character is not easily understood by Westerners and so the ethical life of Japan is puzzling. This little volume based on personal observation and careful study is an effort to locate and interpret the basal principle of Japanese morality, which the author finds in *Loyalty*. The discussion is interesting and well written. The principle of loyalty is well illustrated in popular Japanese stories and is discussed philosophically in relation to Shinto and Buddhism and to Christianity. It seems not to have occurred to the author that loyalty might be taken as a keyword to the morality of any system quite as well as of those of Japan. It is only a question as to the relations in which loyalty is manifested. Loyal to what? and why? These are the real questions. Loyalty would seem to be only another word for faithfulness to the ethical relations and so a sort of measure of morality quantitatively, rather than an explanation of morality qualitatively.

The book is full of life and interest and will help the reader of limited knowledge to a better understanding of Japanese ideals.

It affords encouragement, too, for the Christian missionary.

W. O. CARVER.

Yin Chih Wen. The Tract of the Quiet Way with Extracts from the Chinese Commentary.

Translated from the Chinese by Teitoro Suzuki and Dr. Paul Carus. Edited by Dr. Paul Carus, with frontispiece. Chicago, Open Court Publishing Co. Pages, 48.

Only six of the pages are occupied with the *Tract* proper. These are proverbs mostly in the form of moral commands and of a high order, in the main. They are drawn from all the religious sources in China with a slight Buddhistic preference. The editor's somewhat elaborate *Introduction* rather exaggerates the importance of the little tract of which he says "there is probably no family in China without it" (!). The date is assigned as "certainly not * * later than about 1600 A. D."

This is its first presentation in English.

W. O. CARVER.

T'ai-Shang Kan-Ying P'ien. Treatise of the Exalted One on Response and Resolution.

Translated from the Chinese by Teitoro Suzuki and Dr. Paul Carus, containing Introduction, Chinese Text, Verbatim Translation, Translation, Explanatory Notes and Moral Tales. Edited by Dr. Paul Carus, with sixteen plates by Chinese artists and a frontispiece by Keichyu Yamada. Chicago, Ill., The Open Court Publishing Co. London, Kegan Paul, Trench Trübner and Co., Ltd. 1906. Pages, 139.

The Chinese work here translated, the editor claims, is the most popular "of all publications on the globe," "measured by either the number of copies in which they appear or the devotion of their readers" exceeding both the Bible and Shakespeare, a piece of information to be assigned to the class "important if true." The editor's *Introduction* occupies the first ten pages. *The Chinese Text with Verbatim Translation*, on opposite pages, brings us to p. 47. Thirty-two pages are occupied with the smoother *Translation and Explanatory Notes*. Fifty-six pages are devoted to the *Moral Tales* illustrative of the main work, together with notes; the sources and relation of these *Tales* to the main work is not made plain.

The work is described as a Taoist treatise with Buddhist and Confucian influences. It is rather more Buddhist than Taoist, though these two elements are about equally evident. The *Moral Tales* are decidedly Buddhist.

The whole work is of decided interest to the student of Chinese religion and morals. Several notes illustrate the well-known attitude of the editor toward Christianity. We cannot judge of the translation but it would seem to have been done with care.

W. O. CARVER.

IV. CHURCH HISTORY.

Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten.

Zweite neu durchgearbeitete Auflage mit elf Karten, 2Bd, von Adolph Harnack. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung in Leipzig. 1906. Price in cloth, 15 m.

The first edition of this great work was reviewed at length in the columns of the *Review and Expositor* for January, 1905. The constant use of the book since has but confirmed and deepened the favorable impression then expressed. The author's knowledge of the literature of the period is astounding. His interpretation may not always be accepted, and he leaves small room for the presence of the Divine in the progress of Christian work; but his treatment and information are exhaustive. The critics of the first edition have not led him to change the views then expressed in any important respect. The author's studies have continued since the appearance of the first edition and the additional material has been incorporated, increasing the size of the work somewhat in spite of a few omissions of material found in the first edition. This is especially the case in the fourth book which deals with the statistical part of the subject—the location, size, etc., of the churches at the end of the period. There are additions elsewhere, sometimes in footnotes and sometimes in the text. There is also an effort to give more life and color to the course of the history in various provinces. Although there is in the new edition, no important change of view as to the method and progress of Christianity there is considerable addition to the material offered. It is and will long continue to be

the great work on all phases of missionary history in the first three centuries. The new edition is provided with several maps, drawn by Harnack himself and illustrating by the use of colors and otherwise the spread of Christianity from period to period and province to province. These are very valuable, being the result of the thorough study of the greatest historian of this period now living. The new edition unfortunately appears in two volumes, thereby losing in its usability. The first edition has very recently appeared in an English translation, "The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries," Williams & Norgate, London. It seems a pity that it could not have been a translation of this new and revised and more complete edition.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Democracy in the Church.

By Edgar L. Heermance. The Pilgrim Press, Boston. 1906. Pp. 1-268.

This work is called forth by two demands of the times, viz.: Christian union and more efficient organization for the work of the kingdom of God. The author believes that Democratic or Congregational principles of church government furnish the only possible basis of Christian union and at the same time the best basis for Christian work. Moreover he believes Democratic principles are biblical though not worked out in detail. The four essential principles of a church as set forth by Christ are: (a) Its members are genuine Christians, (b) closely and permanently associated, (c) for the promotion of the kingdom of God, and (d) genuinely loyal to this purpose. pp. 12 f. He finds that these principles were realized in the earliest churches, but passed away in the second century before the progress of a rising oligarchy. Democracy was revived in the Reformation era by the Anabaptists and Robert Browne, the founders of the modern congregational type of church government. The author dis-

cusses at some length the various modifications of theory and practice among American Congregationalists during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, admitting that in the earlier years there was a strong Presbyterian tendency and that "to the Baptist churches in America belongs the honor of being the first to hold, both in theory and practice, a direct democracy." p. 67. This direct democracy is made efficient for the larger work by the right of Christian association. These larger associations can have neither legislative nor judicial functions because the local churches exercise neither of these functions; but they can and should have administrative functions, because administration is the *raison d'être* of the local churches and can be delegated to a larger body. If representative bodies are confined to administration they do not in any way endanger the freedom of the churches. Here lies the possibility of Christian union, which in its last analysis is a question of polity. Let the general bodies of other churches give up their legislative and judicial functions and the congregational churches organize general bodies with administrative functions, and the union can be easily accomplished. pp. 102 f. The author's idea of church union is peculiar: "One church in a town, to include all the Christians in that town, of all shades of belief and opinion and preference." p. 111. If this is impossible because of the size of the town or sharp religious differences then we must have "a brotherhood of self-governing churches, held together by sympathy and work, not by legislative and judicial machinery. For this latter there can be no place." p. 113. We must "pool our differences and our agreements." p. 113. How far this differs from the present relations of the denominations where fraternal feelings exist, it is impossible to see; nor is the gain to accrue from such a state apparent. The most we can do for Christian union is to cultivate Christian fraternity.

Again the author is utterly confused and confusing on the basis and meaning of infant baptism. Believer's baptism symbolized "entrance on Christ's service," "the washing away of sin," "a real cleansing of the heart, a making over of the life, through the influence of Christ." p. 159. Not so with infant baptism. It is not a symbol of anything, but "rather the solemn form by which the parents and the church appropriate for a child all the love and power which are at the command of God's true sons. We take a covenant for him." p. 163. "The value of baptism will depend on the spiritual atmosphere of the home in which the child grows up. Baptism of a child by a Christian church where neither parent is a member of that church would in most cases be meaningless." p. 165. In other words there are two baptisms with totally different meanings, one for believers, another for children. Nothing could be more illogical or devoid of Scriptural foundation. Baptism is one and whatever it means for believers, it means for children if they are to be baptized. There is but one logical ground for infant baptism and that is baptismal regeneration. The author admits that "believer's baptism was certainly the ordinary practice in the primitive church." Infant baptism in the New Testament is only "probable," "but here again, we believe, the almost universal practice of the Christian church from early times is a natural and legitimate development of Christ's command and the apostles' practice." p. 157. The author should have told us that the "early times" begin about the middle or end of the third century.

The book is an able presentation of the author's views, fresh and suggestive, fair and fraternal.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

John Calvin, Organizer of Reformed Protestantism.

By Williston Walker, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906. \$1.50.

We have here the latest volume in the *Heroes of the*

Reformation series, edited by Dr. Samuel Macauley Jackson. The characteristics of this series are well known to those who have seen or used the previous volumes. They are generally marked by freshness of research, balance of judgment, modern view-point, clear style, and brevity. The present volume keeps pace with its predecessors in these respects. It is a fresh, able, interesting and valuable study of the great Genevese reformer. It is the fruit of years of patient study. While greatly condensed in presentation, the material is thoroughly sifted and weighed. It is really remarkable how much important information is contained in so brief a compass. Nothing that is essential in the life of the great theologian seems to have been slighted, and yet the absence of prolixity and detail is notable. The great authorities have been carefully studied, and back of them, all available sources also have been subjected to painstaking review. The forces and movements which made possible Calvin's career are briefly but intelligently presented. The early years and training of the precocious young scholar are appreciatively and discriminatingly studied. Keen interest is awakened by the discussion of Calvin's "sudden conversion"—as he himself calls it. That brief phrase in the preface to Calvin's commentary on Psalms, has given his biographers, early and more recent, a great deal of trouble. To understand precisely what he meant by it, or to date the occurrence itself, has been a task for criticism, and the variety of opinion among competent authors is continued evidence of the difficulty in hand. Professor Walker deals with it as well as could be under the circumstances. He wisely says (page 90): "To the present writer none of the careful interpretations just cited is held to be satisfactory, but he can offer his own attempted reconstruction only with the consciousness that it is equally tentative and fallible." He thinks that Calvin's family experience—his father and brother having fallen under discipline—tended to loosen the hold of

the Roman church upon him. He thinks also that something must be allowed to the influence of Calvin's kinsman, Olivetan, and to that of his teacher, Wolmar, and that these influences came to a head, in his own reflection, after the publication of his *Commentary on Seneca* in 1532, and the delivery of Nicholas Cop's famous inaugural address on becoming rector of the University at Paris, in November, 1533. Notwithstanding the obscurity of this event its reality and importance are properly discussed. The next great event in Calvin's life is the publication of his *Institutes* in 1536, and this receives its due and well considered study. The early work at Geneva, the busy intermission while in exile in Strasburg, the return to Geneva, and the forming of its ecclesiastical constitution are sketched with intelligence and clearness. The great tragedy in Calvin's career, the condemnation and execution of Servetus, receives particularly careful and judicious treatment. Calvin's responsibility and blameworthiness in that terrible affair are not minimized, while the general sentiment of the age, which was favorable to such persecutions, is properly estimated and the aggravating nature of the circumstances which led to the execution are properly weighed. The character of Calvin, and both his contemporary and posthumous influence are wisely estimated. The description of his closing years and enormous labors is well done. Upon the whole, both Professor Walker and his readers—and they should be many—are to be congratulated upon his achievement.

E. C. DARGAN.

The Life of Sir George Williams, Founder of the Young Men's Christian Association.

By J. E. Hodder Williams. A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York. 1906. Pp., 358.

Perhaps no religious movement of the nineteenth century has proven more beneficent in the past and holds greater promise of usefulness in the future than the

Young Men's Christian Association. Its origin, growth and power is one of the marvels of recent religious history. It is, therefore, a matter of more than common interest when the authorized and official biography of Sir George Williams, its founder, appears. All the world knows something of his wonderful career, but in the volume before us we have for the first time the story of his life adequately told. Probably never in history has there been a Christian layman who was more widely useful than Sir George Williams. The eighth and youngest son of a poor farmer of Somersetshire, South-western England, with little education and no influence beyond personal merit, he built up a large fortune, founded the Y. M. C. A., was knighted by Queen Victoria and died honored by the whole Christian world. His sincerity, simplicity, tact and intense piety made him one of the most successful missionaries to young men of all. His business methods were models for Christian men in their sterling honesty and their care for employees. It is a fascinating story admirably told. It is a message, an evangel, to the young business men of our time. Naturally much of the early history of the Y. M. C. A. is treated and illuminated by this life of its founder.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Saint Francis of Assisi, Social Reformer.

By Leo L. Dubois, S.M. Benziger Brothers, New York. 1906. Pp., 250.

This work approaches the study of Francis from a new view-point, which, however, is justified by the results of his labors. His primary object was of course religious; but his religion was of that type that finds its best expression in social service. There was mystic contemplation, but only to gather strength for the battle of practical life. Francis and his companions profoundly affected the common people for the better. They lived among the poor, ignorant, degraded and suffering and

brought light and hope to them. Denying themselves all earthly goods they were in a position to know the poor. But their influence extended in other directions. They stimulated art and learning, and gave a smart uplift to society.

The author is a Catholic and the work has the approval of the church; but it is liberal in spirit. It recognizes the excellence of the work of Sabatier and other Protestant scholars in elucidating the life of Francis. The author strives to stir a middle course between the extreme Catholic and Protestant writers. There is an appendix treating the sources and the more recent literature on Francis. Altogether this new study of Francis was worth while and throws some additional light on the subject.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

Militia Christi. Die Christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten.

Von Adolf Harnack. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, Germany. 1905. Pp., 129. Price M 2.80.

This pamphlet is a by-product of Harnack's studies for his recent great work, "The Extension of Christianity in the First Three Centuries." It is strange that so interesting and important a subject as the attitude of the early Christians toward war and military service has not had adequate treatment earlier. Harnack has at length supplied that lack. It is done with his usual masterful touch and exhaustive handling. He treats the subject under two general divisions; (1) the figurative use of war-images in describing the various phases of Christian life and (2) the attitude of Christians toward actual military service in the imperial armies. After pointing out the fact of "holy wars" in the course of Christian history and the presence of military organization in some monastic orders, in the Salvation Army and elsewhere, and the presence of the military spirit despite the peaceful character of Christianity, he turns to the discussion of the extensive use of military language in the descrip-

tion of the Christian life. This was inherited in part from Judaism, in part from other religions and arose in part from military expressions used by Christ, by Paul and others. Paul especially emphasizes the idea that the Christian is a warrior, especially the Christian missionary. Harnack thinks some of Paul's expressions were influential in the development of the clergy as an order and the later development of monasticism, but in this position he overworks his material. Leaving the New Testament literature he finds a continuation of this imagery in abundance down to the time of Constantine; but the war was always a spiritual one and actual resistance, even to the terrible persecutions of the time, was not one time preached in all the period.

Turning to the second question Harnack finds that the great body of Christian writers opposed military service on the part of Christians and that the great majority of Christians shunned the service. This opposition was due to the general opposition of Christianity to war and the shedding of blood, to the fact that officers must occasionally inflict the death penalty, to the idolatry and emperor-worship required of soldiers, to the low moral life of the army, etc. It is interesting to note the opposition of the early Christians to military service, to the holding of civil office, to capital punishment and to oaths, four points on which the sects of the Middle Ages and the later Anabaptists were unanimous. On the other hand there is abundance of evidence that there were many Christians in the army. Tertullian, one of the most violent opponents of the service, admits their presence in the army in considerable numbers. The first great recognition of Christianity was in the army when Constantine raised the sign of the cross at the Milvian bridge and threw himself upon the Christian soldiers for support. After the recognition of Christianity by Constantine opposition to military service on the part of the church ceased. In fact Harnack maintains that the term *pagan*

did not mean countryman as against city man as was formerly supposed, but civilian as against soldier; the imagery of war had so completely taken hold upon the imagination of the Christians by the end of the Fourth century or earlier that they regarded themselves as warriors while all others were civilians, *pagans*. In this view he has the support of Bigg, the English historian. An appendix contains the passages on which the conclusions are based.

This brief notice will serve to give some idea of the contents of this suggestive and valuable treatment of an important subject.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Studies in Early Church History.

By Henry T. Sell, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Pp., 162. Price, 50 cents.

This is one of the volumes in Sell's Bible Study Text Books and is intended for popular Bible classes. It deals with the history of Christianity up to the time of Constantine. For its purposes it is well done. It is a pity that the value of church history for Bible classes, prayer-meeting talks, etc., is so little recognized. If this little work serves to popularize the subject it will have done a good work. Pastors would find it quite helpful in this direction.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Wesley and His Preachers. Their Conquest of Britain.

By G. Holden Pike. T. Fisher Unwin, London. Pp., 310. Price, 3s. 6d.

This work is not an orderly life of Wesley nor is it intended for scholars. It is based chiefly on Tyerman's Life and on Wesley's Diary. It might be called "Popular Studies in Certain Phases of the Great Methodist Movement." This will be seen from the titles of some of the chapters: "Some Characteristics of the Man," "The Early Assistant Preachers," "Some Characteristics of the Work," "Travelling and Travellers," "Some

Phases of Town and Village Life," "The Common People," etc. The book is chiefly valuable in its presentation of the conditions which met Wesley and his preachers in England, Scotland and Ireland. Still even here it adds little or nothing to Tyerman which still remains the masterpiece on the life of Wesley. Its easy, flowing style and vivid portrayal of eighteenth century conditions will make it helpful and pleasant reading for those who do not care to go into the larger work.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung. In neun Bänden.

Von Theodor Lindner, Professor an der Universität Halle. Vierter Band, Der Stillstand des Orients und das Aufsteigen Europas. Die deutsche Reformation. J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, Stuttgart. 1905. Pp., 473. Price M5.50.

The Germans are the great writers of universal histories (Weltgeschichte). While there are no good general histories in English, there are a number in German and here comes another. The author thinks this to be "the psychological moment" for such a new attempt, because it is now for the first time possible to write a real universal history for which the diligent and minute investigations of recent years have prepared the material. His is to be a history of the development of the present day world, "to comprehend the times in their significance for the whole," a tracing of causes and effects rather than a description of events themselves. This is the true ideal for the general historian to hold before himself, but the author has not lived up to his ideal very well. He has sometimes given undue space to things German, and especially things Prussian, when judged from the standpoint of universal history; but he usually chooses the important, the significant; the progress of the narrative is never lost in details, nor do political relations absorb all the space. Economic, so-

cial, cultural, moral and religious questions receive a due share of attention. And yet one misses something, that masterful grasp of all the forces in society, which the writer of universal history above other men, should have. Space does not permit review of the work in detail, but it should be said that the treatment of the Renaissance and Reformation are specially valuable and suggestive.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Persia, Past and Present. A Book of Travel and Research with more than two hundred illustrations and a map.

By A. V. Williams Jackson, Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages, and sometime Adjunct Professor of the English Language and Literature in Columbia University. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1906. Pp., 467.

Persia is one of the oldest empires in the world, and yet it remains largely unknown to us Western peoples. A book, therefore, like the present is very welcome. It is a book of travel, but one of more than ordinary interest. It is written by a scholar and experienced traveler, acquainted with the literature, language, customs and history of the country, interested in the important things and knowing how to see them. It is not, therefore, the newspaper jottings of the globe-trotter. There are interesting notes of travel, but also chapters of research. The journey was not long in duration, but it covered those portions of Persia which hold most that is of literary, religious, historical and antiquarian interest. The volume is a splendid example of book-making. The numerous illustrations are made from excellent and illuminating photographs, and the work was admirably done. With this book one can make a very interesting and instructive "stay at home" journey to Persia and Central Asia.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

V. SYSTEMATIC AND APOLOGETIC THEOLOGY.

A Manual of Theology.

By Joseph Agar Beet, D.D. A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York. 1906.

This is a comprehensive volume of 559 pages, charmingly written and pleasing in its mechanical execution. The author is sane, scholarly and spiritual. He is at home in various branches of allied knowledge, and therefore presents his topics in large and attractive perspective. He is well acquainted with the history of doctrine, and is aware of the theological trend of the present day, but what is far better though of less frequent occurrence, he has an intelligent, profound and sympathetic grasp of biblical truth. The scope of the work can be best indicated by giving the topics of the eleven parts into which the book is divided. Nature and God; Christianity and Christ; The Sacred Records; The Father, Son and Spirit; Man: Created and Ruined; The Gospel of Pardon; Through Christ Jesus; The New Life in Christ; The Divine-human Christian Life; The Church of Christ; The Last Things. The author unifies a study of the Canon, Ecclesiology, Pastoral Duties, a brief history of many important doctrines, and the topics ordinarily discussed in theological treatises. He meets critical problems fairly and adopts a judicious historical method. He keeps both eyes open, and is not afraid to adopt traditional views when they seem best, neither is he slow to modify them when his investigations lead him to this conclusion.

The author seems to be fair-minded and does not deal in acrimonious denunciations. His spirit is admirable, style clear, vigorous and unusually attractive. He gives copious references to the Bible, and shows rare power in their combination and interpretation.

He is a Trinitarian and Post Millennarian. He hinges his faith in miracles on the resurrection of Jesus Christ

which he considers historically proved beyond the shadow of intelligent doubt. As to the atonement he says that "in the death of Christ, we see the Father not overriding but submitting to his own law." God in the death of Christ maintains the inevitable moral sequence of sin and death. The atonement "safeguards the announcement of pardon for all who repent" and prevents man from perverting the forbearance of God and the doctrine of forgiveness. "In the need for this safeguard against immoral misuse, lies the absolute necessity of the death of Christ for the pardon of sins, which underlies the entire New Testament." But one is inclined to ask whether the atonement is intended more as a preventive of man's misuse of divine mercy, or as a necessity of God's holiness and man's sinfulness. The discussion of this topic is fresh and vigorous though one may dissent from his position, or believe that he falls short of the full biblical presentation. He accepts the position of the original innocence of man, and consequent fall so that all are now by nature the "children of wrath."

He is unusually clear in his presentation of the believer's union with Christ by personal faith and the privilege and duty of a blessed assurance of salvation. His doctrine of the "eternal forethought of God" in which the "two elements in God's purpose of salvation are a selection or choice or election of the objects of salvation and a marking out beforehand or foreordination or predestination of the goal to which he purposes to lead them," is clearly presented. He thinks the original material creation included merely a homogeneous substance, "for heterogeneity would imply a previous history." The original matter was divinely endowed with all the necessary forces for the future stages of Theistic evolution. He bases his doctrine of human freedom upon the testimony of conscience and history. "We can not throw off a conviction that we are ourselves the ultimate source of our own action" and that our sense of

responsibility is such a powerful deterrent from sin that it cannot be considered a delusion. He traces the church idea from the congregation of Israel where membership was national to the assembly of the saints in Christ where the membership is personal. He frankly admits that there is no scriptural authority for infant baptism but strangely argues that as Abraham was circumcised when an adult and Isaac when an infant, so the descendedants of Abraham may be baptized in either maturity or infancy.

The infants of any parents, believers or unbelievers, may be baptized. How does the following sound in this day of classical and biblical learning? In speaking of baptize he says: "In classical, and more frequently in later, Greek, the word is occasionally used in the sense of dip, or sink, or soak." His remarkable comment on Rom. 6:4 and Col. 2" is thus presented as a rebuttal to the contention that "buried with Christ" means immersion. "But in ancient Greece, the sprinkling of a handful of dust was a valid burial." His array of scriptures on the topic of future retribution is excellent but his conclusion is foggy. "The New Testament writers agree to describe with more or less definiteness, the doom of the lost as utter ruin including actual suffering and final exclusion from the blessedness of the saved. They do not say or suggest that their agony will ever sink into unconsciousness; nor do they plainly and categorically assert its endless continuance. A few important passages look forward to the universal homage of a ransomed race and universe; but not in a way which implies the ultimate salvation of all men now living."

All in all it is one of the best of the valuable English treatises on theology, in thought, comprehensiveness, development, style and spirit.

BYRON H. DEMENT.

Christ and Science.

By Professor Francis Henry Smith. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, Toronto.

This volume consists of the Cole Lectures which were delivered by Prof. Smith in the year 1906 at Vanderbilt University. The Cole Lectureship was founded by Col. E. W. Cole, of Nashville, Tenn., with a view to establishing a course of lectures annually in the defense and advocacy of the Christian Religion. Prof. Smith has done excellent work in this volume. The aim is to show that the progress of modern science has not been away from but in the direction of Jesus Christ. Christ is the center of science as it exists to-day. There are six lectures, on "The Old Testament in Its Relation to Physical Science," "The New Testament in Its Relation to Physical Science," "Scientific Hints in Both Testaments," "Christ's Love of Nature," "Christ the Model for the Teacher of Science," "The Great Teacher Himself." In the lecture on The Old Testament and Science the author shows that the universe, as revealed in the Old Testament, is made up of matter, energy and life, and this conforms to the conclusions of modern science. Modern science leads to the conclusion that the universe is super-physical in origin. There are three great generalizations which characterize the Nineteenth Century and cause it to stand forth first in all the centuries. One of these is the conservation of matter, another is the conservation of energy, and the third is the continuity of life. Each one of these generalizations which science has made in the Nineteenth Century leads us back through an indefinite past in which we find at no point an explanation of the origin of things. We find nothing but transformation from one form to another in the various objects and forces of nature. The question of the first cause is not answered by science, but this conclusion as to the continuity of life and the conservation of matter and energy inevitably leads to the necessity for a first cause for all

things, which accords with the teachings of Jesus Christ.

In the second chapter on the New Testament and Physical Science the author shows that the traits of character which are required in the study of nature are the same as those inculcated by Jesus Christ. The fundamental qualities required by the scientist are humility, simplicity, love of truth, and faith, and these are the cardinal virtues in the Christian ideal of character.

In the third chapter the author gives hints which point toward the conclusions of modern science. Among these may be named the fact that light is, in Genesis, declared to have existed before the sun, which accords with modern scientific theory; and another illustration of the same point is the introduction and progress of life on the earth. The author says that the progress of life, as taught by modern science, is in accordance with revelation in Genesis. In the closing chapters he gives interesting discussions on Christ as a teacher.

This book will find many readers who will be greatly helped by its insight into modern science and its interpretations of Christianity from the scientific point of view. It is a valuable addition to the numerous books which have been written in recent years to aid the faith of the wavering and the doubting whose faith has been disturbed by the supposed results of scientific research.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The World's Desires or The Results of Missions. An Elementary Treatise on a Realistic Religion and Philosophy of Human Life.

By Edgar A. Ashcroft. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner Co., Ltd. Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Co., Ltd. 1905. Pp., 450.

A well printed, attractive looking volume with an engaging literary style is this effort to set forth the results for religion and philosophy of that Materialism that seeks to go under the more popular title of *Monism*.

It is quite generally recognized nowadays that Materialism furnishes no sound basis for a philosophical sys-

tem, but Monism is quite popular and Haeckel and his followers have appropriated the name for a system far more allied with philosophic Materialism.

This work discusses "The Problems of Human Life and Thought," "Our Knowledge of the Material Universe," "The Human Organism, and Organic Life," "The Human Soul." This fourth topic is a misnomer for the author is emphatically dogmatic in his denial of the existence of any such entity as the term *soul* naturally suggests. Indeed, the work is far more negative and destructive than positive and constructive. Where positive elements of religion are presented they are confessedly imaginary structures, out of materials, however, drawn from the most solid fact as attested by "unerring" "scientific processes." The discussion is fearless, even reckless, and fascinates somewhat as the performance of a rope-dancer. Logical consistency and scientific exactness put no limitations on the author's affirmations or conjectures. He is peculiarly unfortunate in his references to the Scriptures, displaying a truly astounding ignorance of both the letter and spirit of their content; as when he attributes to Jesus a saying from the Prayer-book, or credits Paul with frequent use of a saying that is the exact contradiction of what Paul does affirm, or, worst of all, when he criticises the "Ten Commandments" for containing "no injunction against lying or cheating." The ethics of "the religion of realism" will not likely be commended by the assurance that "no final ideals or absolute standards of religious or other practice are possible for successful application to human conditions. The sole rules of conduct for state and individual must be, enlightened expediency and utility, and the laws and customs which shall from time to time be based thereon by experience, as interpreted by the approved authorities appointed by the community"; nor again by the promise that under this system "no longer will vast social cankers on the

one hand, and ridiculous unnatural prudery, and sexual starvation, on the other, be the tacitly accepted relations between men and women."

Of course the work frankly denies God and it makes sport of the Psalmist's declaration that "the fool hath said in his heart there is no God." He charges to religious institutions the persistent prevalence of ignorance.

One ought, if possible, to give the work credit for its constructive elements; but, as already intimated, these are wrought in the imagination and present only "possibilities" and "probabilities" as also do they deal in the broadest generalities with promise of detailed exposition in a volume to follow this.

The work is appropriately dedicated to Ernst Haeckel
 "by permission."

W. O. CARVER.

Haeckel's Monism False. An Examination of "The Riddle of the Universe"; "The Wonders of Life"; "The Confessions of a Man of Science." By Professor Haeckel, together with "Haeckel's Critics," by Mr. Joseph McCabe.

By Frank Ballard, M.A., B.D., B. Sc., F. R. M. S., etc. Author of "The Miracles of Unbelief", "Clarion Fallacies", "Which Bible to Read", "The Mission of Christianity", "Reasonable Orthodoxy", etc. London, Charles H. Kelley. XVI, + 605 pages.

So little is Haeckel read on this side of the water, and so few are the believers in his gross materialism, so very different indeed are all the real philosophical tendencies, both scholastic and popular, that one is quite shocked by the apparent need for English readers of so voluminous a review of the vociferous German scholar's positions. In England there is large following for materialism among a class that in this country have not yet come to account themselves philosophers at all. There are special conditions, ecclesiastical, political and social, for setting this class of better artisans and tradesmen against the more cultured forms of philosophy and religion; conditions that

do not yet obtain in America and some of which could find no place in our life.

For this class very largely Mr. Ballard has for years been a most watchful, sincere and competent guardian and defender of the Faith of the Gospel. He stands as an example of the *polemic* rather than the *apologist* and as such gives good account of himself. He wants nothing of his usual vigor in this volume and has somewhat more of comprehensiveness than his discussions usually have allowed.

That English readers could be found for Haeckel's works and expositions of them by the hundred thousand is somewhat surprising and is a proof of the energetic propaganda of "Rationalist Press Association."

One who desires to read a remarkably vigorous, frank, incisive polemic against Haeckel and his advocates will do well to get this work, but one can hardly think much need for it will be found in America. We have many and serious forms of skepticism and of aggressive attack on Christianity here, but Haeckel's specific form will not soon do us serious harm.

W. O. CARVER.

VI. NEW TESTAMENT.

All About the Bible.

By Sidney Collett. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Pp., 324.

The fullness of the claims of this book cannot be quite appreciated without reading its subtitle: "Its Origin—Its Language—Its Translation—Its Canon—Its Symbols—Its Inspiration—Its Alleged Errors and Contradictions—Its Plan—Its Science—Its Rivals" (all in three hundred and twenty-four pages!!) It is unfortunate that the author makes such claims for his book. It is intended as an answer to questions which puzzled the author twenty-five years ago, but it does not deal with the questions which are most important to-day, or

if it does touch them it is to be feared that its method and manner will prevent it from being as helpful as desired. The infallibility of Archbishop Ussher's chronology seems generally assumed; it is insisted that the word "day" in the creation narrative must have been used literally; an argument for the Trinity is found in the ordinary Hebrew sign of the accusative case as used in Gen. 1. 1; a proof that God planned the Bible is based on the character of Ps. CXVIII. 8, which is called the middle verse of the Bible, as if Stephen's dividing the Bible into verses in the XVI. century were as divinely guided as the original authors, and as if the correction of the mistakes of copyists had not changed the number of verses in the New Testament; it is said that the glacial period "was probably caused by the withdrawal of the light and heat of the sun from the world at a time prior to the reconstitution of the world for man as recorded in Gen. 1," and other examples of unwise assertion and argument abound. However cordially we recognize the excellent purpose of the author and the value of some of the material which he has collected, it must no less be recognized that his work will tend rather to the confirmation of those already fully holding the author's position than to confute antagonists or convince doubters; it is even to be feared that it will multiply doubters and furnish material for antagonists.

D. F. ESTES.

An Introduction to the New Testament.

By Adolf Jülicher, Professor of Theology at the University of Marburg. Translated by Janet Penrose Ward with Prefatory Note by Mrs. Humphry Ward. Smith, Elder and Co., London. 1904.

This is a new edition of the well-known work of the author which appeared in 1894, with new material covering some 100 pages. Impelled by contributions which German, English and French writers have made in wonderful fullness and variety to New Testament science during the last six years, he has once more, he says, worked through all problems properly belonging to an

“Introduction,” and here gives the results. His general aim is to tell the history of the New Testament from its beginnings in the simplest possible way, confining himself to essentials; but he feels compelled to discuss new questions that have been raised, set forth new solutions of old problems, and, in general, to acquaint the reader with the special circumstances and influences affecting the whole subject at the opening of the new century. This he does avowedly to meet a want that undoubtedly exists outside of theological circles, among people of education who crave a *strictly historical treatment of the New Testament*. What that means in this connection is well enough understood. The largest share of the work of revision has gone to Part I., the history of the different books of the New Testament. He tackles anew the problems connected with the Gospel of John and the Acts; and, in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, the Apocalypse, the Catholic Epistles, and many Pauline Epistles, including the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle by the Hebrews, he makes it clear that he has not ceased to learn.

As Mrs. Humphry Ward says, “It would be difficult to find either in English or German a more masterly statement, within reasonable compass, of the Synoptic problem, or of the probable conditions governing the composition of the Fourth Gospel, or of the difficulties that surround the Acts, or, above all, of the History of the Canon and the Text.” The author is everywhere vigorous, never insincere, and while, according to the spirit of his school, he employs a method of large freedom, his freedom is no mere cloak for critical license, and his eagerness as critic or historian does not rob him of common sense. In some things Jülicher, on the liberal side, and Weiss, on the conservative agree, reminding one of Harnack’s saying, that when these two agree it is unnecessary for any aftercomer to reopen a question. With Zahn, the champion of orthodox criticism in Germany, he

is constantly at feud, and even stigmatizes him as "the great misleader" in the theological field. We trust that in this titanic struggle of advancing knowledge the true knowledge of Christ is in no peril. GEO. B. FAGER.

Novum Testamentum Graece Cum Apparatu Critico.

Eberhard Nestle. Editio sexta recognita. Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, Germany, 1906. Price, M. 1.20 for linen paper edition, M. 3 for chagrin leather and India paper edition, M. 4 for chagrin leather and India paper with gold lettering.

This is the ideal Greek New Testament for the pocket or the traveling bag as well as for a good many other purposes. It has excellent type and is very small and handy. The soft red leather cover makes it exceedingly attractive. The text has the advantage of a brief critical apparatus, giving the readings of the important editions of the Greek New Testament. Dr. Nestle has done a fine piece of work and it is no wonder that six editions have already been called for. His publishers publish the book in various bindings at several prices. Dr. Nestle has just gotten out a Latin New Testament also which promises to be very useful. Few men know the New Testament text as well as Dr. Nestle. This present New Testament is a different edition from the recent revision of Scrivener. Dr. Nestle is a tireless and prolific worker.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

A Commentary on the New Testament.

By Professor Bernhard Weiss, D.D., of the University of Berlin. Translated by Prof. Schodde and Prof. Wilson. Introduction by Prof. Riggs. Four volumes. Price, \$3.00 per volume. 1906. Funk and Wagnalls, New York.

Weiss has been a student of the New Testament for fifty years. No living man knows his New Testament better than he. He is a scholar of the first rank and has retained his faith in Jesus as God and Savior and holds to the genuineness of the New Testament books. It is comforting to think of Weiss and Zahn standing by the guns while the storm has raged in Germany. They are

the two best equipped New Testament scholars of Germany. Weiss has written on the life of Christ, on New Testament introduction, on Biblical theology, on the text, and many commentaries. These present volumes are in a sense the cream of it all for the general student. He has made an interpretative paraphrase of the whole New Testament in flowing style so that one can find his idea on most disputed points at a glance. The text at the top of the page is that of the American Revision. For the busy man and one who cannot handle technical details this is the book. One will not agree with all that Weiss says, but he will say a deal that is helpful and wise.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Sermon on the Mount. A Study.

By J. B. Shearer, D.D., LL.D, Professor of Biblical Instruction, Davidson College. Pp., 146. Cloth, 60 cents net. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

Dr. Shearer's viewpoint is that the sermon is "an exhaustive discussion of Pharisaism." Matt. v. 20 is the theme; v. 3-19 is introductory; the discussion falls under four heads (1) literalism (v. 21-48), (2) formalism (vi. 1-18), (3) covetousness (vi. 19-34), and (4) censoriousness (vii. 1-6); the conclusion (vii. 7-29), consists of six applications. Dr. Shearer rejects the view that Jesus adds to or completes the law. The law was holy, just and good. He simply expounds the law which he gave at Sinai. In this sermon he does that incidentally as he exposes Pharisaic additions and misinterpretations.

This attitude toward the Mosaic law is preferable to the easygoing and superficial habit of finding fault with Old Testament morality and it is true so far as the moral law is concerned. But is it not also true that Jesus does contrast the laws of His kingdom with *the civil code* which God established through Moses for the nation? It seems to us that Dr. Shearer scarcely does justice to Matt. 19. 8. Further while it is clear that Jesus has Pharisaism in mind, we do not believe it to be the main

subject of discussion. Rather he is setting forth the laws of the kingdom (essentially the same already announced in the Old Testament, and to this extent we agree with the author) and uses Pharisaism as a dark foil to bring them out in clearer and sharper relief.

There are details of analysis (as e. g. Matt. vii. 1-12) in which we think the author mistaken; on the other hand, there are others (as v. 13 and 33f) to which he brings fresh light. This age of ours, enamored as it is, of evolution and development, would do well to consider dispassionately the author's view of the law and Christ's relation to it.

J. H. FARMER.

The Spiritual Teaching of Christ's Life.

By Rev. Prof. G. Henslow, M.A., F.L.S., etc. Williams and Norgate, London. 1906. Price, 5s net. Pages, 253.

This is a suggestive volume, not a great book, yet a useful one. The style is simple and clear. The writer loyally takes Jesus as both God and man and endeavors to put the Trinitarian idea of Christ in harmony with modern scientific theories. One has the feeling that the book is hardly up to what the title suggests, but possibly that is not practical. There is much of good in it at any rate.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Universality of Jesus.

By Rev. G. A. Johnston Ross, M.A., Cambridge, Eng. Cloth. Pp., 124. Fleming H. Revell Company.

The earnest Christian longs to see Jesus and welcomes whatever helps to clearer vision of Him. This book does that. Mr. Ross was a stranger to this reviewer; but his style is so chaste and captivating, his spirit so evangelical and spiritual, and the thought in these twelve glowing chapters so fresh, vital and stimulating that further messages from his pen will be looked for eagerly. Misprints occur on pages 93 (fourth line) and 95 (fifteenth line.)

J. H. FARMER.

Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Fixierung der Urchristlichen Ueberlieferung.

Von Adolf Harnack. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany. 1906. S. 160. Price. M. 3.50. geb. M. 4.50.

This is a notable contribution to New Testament criticism. Certainly no one will accuse Harnack, the great Ritschlian liberal, of having conservative prejudices. And yet he is wholly convinced that the author of the "we" sources in Acts wrote the whole of the book. He finds sixty-seven words common to the "we" sources and the rest of Acts that are not used in Mark, Matt., John (S. 50). He is sure also that the same man wrote the Acts and Luke's Gospel. He finds forty-three words common to the "we" sources, the rest of Acts, and Luke's Gospel, and not in the other Gospels (S. 53). He is sure that the writer of Acts therefore was a companion of Paul. Once more he is satisfied that this companion of Paul was a physician because of the medical terms used by him, thus accepting Hobart's line of argument in the medical language of Luke. Harnack gives great credit to Ramsay and Hawkins for their work on Luke's writings. Schuerer comes back at Harnack in *Die Theol. Literaturzeitung*, but Harnack holds his ground. One may consider Harnack's championship of Luke as the end of the Baur *Tendenz* hypothesis and a severe blow to the whole radical programme. If the writings of Luke rest on solid ground as do the bulk of Paul's epistles, the origin of Christianity has a clearer historic basis. It will be less possible to evaporate the words and deeds of Jesus by fine-spun critical theories. Certainly the New Testament cannot be considered disposed of and set aside quite yet. Bousset, Wernle, Wrede, N. Schmidt, G. B. Foster will have to try again, for Harnack has written after they have had their say. Critic answers critic. Let them criticize.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Jesus and Paulus. Eine Freundschaftliche Streitschrift gegen die Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbücher. Von D. Bousset und D. Wrede.

Von D. Julius Kaftan. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, Germany. 1906. S. 78. Price, 80 pf.

Dr. Kaftan boldly challenges the picture of Jesus drawn by Bousset. He says that Bousset's historical Christ is not historical (S. 12f), but Bousset's idea of Christ merely. He denies that Bousset and Wrede have properly grasped the real Jesus (S. 8). They misunderstand Jesus's teaching concerning eschatological matters (S. 26f). Kaftan is even more severe on Wrede's treatment of Paul. He mentions five points in which Wrede has failed to give us the real Paul (S. 30f). Wrede's presentation of Paul is "doctrinaire," "subjective," with "no historical understanding" (S. 43). This is rather plain talk to the advance guard of radical criticism, but Kaftan can do it with ease. It is one thing to boast of the historical point of view, but another thing to practice it. The doctors settle accounts with each other. This is the advantage of free criticism.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Essai sur la Christologie de Saint Paul. Première Partie L'Oeuvre.

Par S. Monteil. Librairie Fischbacher, 33 Rue de Seine, Paris, France. 1906. Pages, 264.

This is an able discussion by a young Catholic theologian who is in main quite conservative. He is a man of scholarly tastes and shows much keenness of insight into the questions involved. He discusses admirably Paul's relation to Judaism and Hellenism and their influence on him. He does not think Paul Judaized Christianity (p. 23), though his Christianity is affected naturally by the Jewish and Greek terminology of his time. Monteil is too sure that the death of Christ had no idea of substitution for Paul else he would have said *ἀντί* and not *ὑπέρ* (p. 88). But he for-

gets that neither of these prepositions in themselves means substitution, and as a matter of fact *ὑπέρ* is often used in classic Greek with this resultant idea. In the New Testament that idea is also necessary at times as in John 11:50. He is troubled over *ἀντίλυτρον* in I. Tim. 2:6 and suggests that it is here only "une image" (p. 98). The difficulty with Monteil as with many is that he thinks of substitution only in a mechanical way and does not unite with it the moral and mystic aspects of the death of Christ so plainly taught by Jesus as well as Paul. The vital conception of Christ's death is not inconsistent with the vicarious view of the atonement. But the volume has many striking and quotable passages and suggests comments at every turn. The tone is critical and independent and the style is clear and engaging.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Der Apostel Paulus und Sein Zeugnis von Jesus Christus.

Von Arnold Rüegg. Verlag von Dörffling und Franke, Leipzig, Germany. 1906. S. 132. Pr. M. 1. 60.

This is an acute discussion of the important theme now attracting so much attention in Germany. The author treats carefully Paul's Pharisaism and its relation to his Christianity. He accents strongly the reality of Paul's conversion (S. 41) and admits that he had visions of Jesus (S. 44). He knew of the Messiah before his conversion, but the new point on the road to Damascus was the fact that Jesus the crucified was the Messiah (S. 45). He cannot admit that Paul was a mere epileptic (S. 47). Rüegg further discusses the standpoint of Paul as a witness for Jesus, his method, his field of work, and the results of his lifework. The book shows independence of judgment while he holds fast to many of the essential points in the supernatural manifestations of Jesus to Paul. He regards Paul as a true interpreter of the crucified Savior.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther ausgelegt.

Von Lic. th. Philip Bachmann, o. Professor der Theologie in Erlanger. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsb. Nachf. Leipzig, Germany. 1905. S. 482. Pr. M. 9.

This is volume VII. in Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Bachmann takes the two Corinthian letters to be letters in the narrowest sense (S. 1), not epistles like Romans or Hebrews. The throbbing questions of actual church life are discussed in a practical way in 1 Cor. while in 2 Cor. the inner personal life of Paul throbs in every sentence. These two letters in a sense form a group to themselves (S. 3), though also related to Galatians and Romans. Bachmann's introductory remarks are not lengthy, but are to the point and full of suggestions. The body of the book shows the work of a careful scholar who has independent opinions and who is familiar with the vast literature on 1 Cor. The book is worthy to be in Zahn's great series, which is an expression of the more conservative criticism of Germany. The treatment is scholarly and practical and not as much overburdened with technical details as Meyer, for instance, though Bachmann does not often slur over matters of importance. His remarks on 14:34-36 are rather meager, but the woman question is not yet a live one in Germany. He rather inclines to take 15:29 (baptism for the dead) as running the risk of death. One could prefer to have the Greek text quoted rather than the German translation as the basis of comment, but then Greek words are often used in the body of the Commentary. There is nothing specially new in Bachmann's treatment of this great book, but he has done his task with distinct ability and success. The Commentary ought to prove very useful to those who have their German in hand.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Die Rhythmen der Asianischen und roemischen Kunstprosa
(Paulus—Hebräerbrief—Pausanias—Cicero—Seneca—Curtius—Apuleius).**

Von Friedrich Blass. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. Leipzig, Germany. 1905. M.6.

Blass is amazingly fertile in producing able books in the linguistic field. He had already written on the rhythm of Attic prose, but he now finds that Asian rhythm was a very different thing. It is marked by breaking up the sentence or the thought in the sentence into separate members which balanced one another, somewhat like the Hebrew parallelism. He holds that this Asian rhythm was current among the Romans, especially Cicero. It avoided harsh elisions. It has been poorly preserved to us, though he finds it in a fourth century papyrus of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Blass traces it back to Hegesias of Magnesia who flourished in the third century B. C. The astonishing part of it all is that so artificial an arrangement should be found in the New Testament, even in Paul and Hebrews, the most literary parts of the New Testament. Luke was slightly Atticistic, Blass thinks. Deissmann (*Theol. Literaturz*, 1906, S. 235 ff.) will have none of it, for the New Testament is written in the vernacular *κοινή*. Blass himself has said (*Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 6) that even the schools of Tarsus could not have taught Paul the historical orthography, and yet he thinks (*Rhythmen, &c.*, S. 43) that he learned the Asian rhythm at Tarsus. It does seem a little odd for so practical a man as Paul to be engaged in so purely artificial a literary device. However, the man who wrote 1 Cor. 13 cannot be accused of inability to write poetic prose. It is not unnatural for a gifted man in moments of high feeling to express himself in unconscious rhythm. I should think that what of balanced and polished phrase one finds in Paul is more unconscious than deliberate. But 1 Cor. 13 prevents one from going as far as Deissmann does on the subject. It is a fresh contribution that Blass has here made, even if he also may have pushed his point too far in the New Testament.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

By Joseph Bryant Rotherham. Published by H. R. Allenson, Ltd., London, England. 1906. Pp., 188. 35 or 50 cents.

The venerable translator of the Emphasized Bible is continuing his excellent scriptural studies. It does not seem long since he published a booklet on the Inspiration, Transmission and Translation of the Bible which won high praise. Now he has turned attention to the contents, and singling out this book as one most needed in our times, he has given sixteen admirable studies, dwelling on the salient points of the epistle. His own translation is the text used, with constant reference to other modern versions, such as the R. V., Lloyd's Corrected New Testament, the Twentieth Century, Weymouth's Modern Speech. On the one hand he does not hesitate to admit occasional doubt as to the ultimate reference of a passage; on the other he generally throws a flood of light on the details, and on the whole broad scope of the treatise.

W. T. WHITLEY.

Der Judasbrief. Seine Echtheit, Abfassungszeit und Leser, Ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in die Katholischen Briefe.

Von Friedrich Maier. Herdersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Freiburg im Breisgau; and B. Herder, 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo. 1906. S. 188. Price, \$1.20.

This book is written by a scholarly Catholic who reaches conservative conclusions, but after a complete discussion of the whole problem. The "Imprimatur" of the Church is stamped on the book, but in spite of that the author has made a vigorous and able discussion of his theme. One is impressed by the evident purpose of the author to be fair. He states the arguments for and against with justice. Another merit of the volume is its completeness. There is a reasonably exhaustive presentation of the whole case with a full bibliography. The writer concluded that the epistle is genuine, was earlier than II. Peter, and was written about 64 or 66 A. D. This is certainly a very probable result and the

conclusion is buttressed by solid arguments that appeal to a balanced mind, while the elements of doubt in the case are duly considered. For English readers who know Greek, Bigg has written the best commentary on Jude and Peter, but this new work of Maier will be appreciated by those who are able to handle clear and easy German. The book is admirably analyzed and has indices also.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Apocalypse of St. John. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices.

By Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, England. Macmillan and Co., London and New York. 1906. Pages 355 and CCXV.

At once this commentary supplants all others as the one great commentary on Revelation. The man and the subject have met, and, one may add, the hour. Ten years ago this commentary could not have been written by anybody, for then it was not possible to apply the new knowledge of Jewish apocalyptic literature and Roman provincial life and worship that we now possess. But Prof. Charles in *Apocalyptic* and Prof. Ramsay on *Asia Minor* have come before. Indeed Prof. Ramsay in his *Letters to the Seven Churches* had made a great contribution directly to the subject in hand.

Dr. Swete has written the best commentary on Mark in addition to his invaluable work on the Septuagint. He belongs to the great Cambridge group of scholars including Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort who undertook a commentary on the New Testament. Westcott on John's Gospel, Epistles, and on Hebrews still hold first place. We have just come into possession of Westcott's posthumous work on Ephesians. Lightfoot's Galatians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon, 1 and 2 Thess. are a treasure to the preacher. Dr. Hort was so given to critical and textual research, the most original scholar of the group, that he did not do his part of the commentary work, as indeed none of them did in full.

But Cambridge has put the whole world in its debt by these commentaries and the great work of Hort.

Dr. Swete's work is a worthy successor in this noble line. It is adequate and sane where most men are erratic and unsatisfactory. Dr. Swete holds to the Domitianic date against the Neronian view of the great Cambridge trio and on this point he is doubtless right. He inclines to the view that John the Apostle is the author, while admitting the possibility that John the Elder may be. He considers the book a unity though use may be made of previous material and the book has the method of Jewish Apocalyptic thought with the spirit of Christian prophecy. Dr. Swete thinks it possible for John also to be the author of the Gospel even with the late date of the Revelation, since he probably dictated the Gospel and had help in revising it also.

Dr. Swete sees in the Revelation a book in the spirit of Christ with the background of the Domitianic persecution impending as a revival of the Neronian horrors. Christianity is face to face with the great world struggle with Rome which city is forcing the worship of the Emperor upon Christians. Final victory is certain though the conflict will be fierce. In this death grapple is set forth the ever recurring battle between the Kingdom of Christ and the world.

Pictures and maps add to the interest and value of the volume. There is a brief discussion of the grammar of the Apocalypse and a complete vocabulary of the book. There are 215 pages of introductory matter. The critical notes are rich in allusion to the Jewish apocalypses, the Old Testament, Christian history and Roman affairs.

In a word, here is just the commentary that the scholarly pastor has long waited for. In the hands of Dr. Swete the book takes shape as a whole and one can use it with more effect now than ever and with more intelligence.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Coming of Christ, both Pre-Millennial and Imminent.

By I. M. Holdeman, D.D. Charles C. Cook, New York. 1906. Pages, 325. Price, \$1.00.

It is no objection to this book that it teaches the doctrine of Christ's return, for this is certainly a teaching of the New Testament, as well as a doctrine of the church universal ever since the formulation of the "Apostles' " creed. It is no objection to this book that it strongly urges that the return will be premillennial and is imminent, for this is the avowed object of the book. Nor should any one speak without due respect of the work of one who both holds an honored place among our churches, and is reverent and diligent in searching the Scriptures. But it is not to be expected that this book will appeal to any who are not already in substantial sympathy with it. There underlies this book a whole system of Hermeneutics (except that the methods have never been systematized and never could possibly be made into anything deserving the name of a system) which is absolutely alien to the methods of sound exegesis. As a result many passages of the New Testament are interpreted in a way that has never commended itself to any considerable number of intelligent and careful interpreters. The untrustworthiness of the exegesis on which the peculiar teaching of this book depends would be manifest if the method employed were exegetical. But as it is rather expository, and the assertions as to the meaning of many texts are, though unjustified, yet made as if the results of sound exegetical study, many may be led to accept the teachings of the author, supposing that a student so diligent and reverent and positive cannot be in error. But while diligence and reverence are indispensable for mastering the teachings of Scripture, even reverent diligence must also be wisely directed and sanely guided. It is not the turrets but the foundations of this work which demand a careful review and thorough testing which the limits of this note do not permit.

D. F. ESTES.